Strategies for Managing and Engaging Students in Large Enrollment Engineering Courses

Ms. Peiran Wang, North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Peiran Wang is a Ph.D. student in Electrical and Computer Engineering at North Carolina State University, advised by Dr. Cranos Williams. Her research focuses on deep learning applications in agricultural data analysis and engineering education, with particular interest in improving student engagement and teaching strategies in large enrollment courses.

Prof. Cranos M. Williams
Dr. Laura Bottomley, North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Dr. Laura Bottomley is the Director of Engineering Education and Senior Advisor to Engineering Academic Affairs at NC State University. She has been working in the field of engineering education for more than 30 years, having taught every grade level from kindergarten to engineering graduate school. She is a Fellow of the IEEE and ASEE and has been recognized with the PAESMEM award.

Strategies for Managing and Engaging Students in Large Enrollment Engineering Courses

This paper is an evidence-based practice full paper on managing and engaging students in large-enrollment engineering courses.

Introduction

Large enrollment engineering courses present great challenges for both instructors and students in STEM programs. Previous research has shown that as class size increases, students in large classes often feel difficulty maintaining attention during the lecture or receiving timely feedback [1], [2]. Studies on instructional improvement suggest several practices that can help students learn more efficiently in large classes. These include short in-class activities connected to assessments, clear grading rules, and regular feedback throughout the semester [3]-[5]. These motivate us to examine how teaching models for large classes can be improved, and whether effective strategies can be identified from prior teaching experience to support student learning. We conducted our study in real classrooms to examine the alignment between instructional strategies and students' expectations in individual engineering courses, each enrolling between 80 and 550 students per semester, at a large public research university. These were standalone undergraduate or graduate engineering courses taught by a single instructor. Through faculty interviews and semester-long student surveys, we analyze instructional strategies related to engagement, grading, TA coordination, technology use, and student support. Our goal is to identify practical teaching approaches and pre-class preparation strategies that instructors can implement without extensive additional workload, and to synthesize these findings into a structured framework for large-enrollment engineering courses.

Background and Motivation

Although several validated teaching methods can increase student engagement, the rapid spread of educational platforms, digital tools, and artificial intelligence has created new challenges for large STEM classes. Instructors must decide which tools to adopt and how to integrate them effectively, yet research on tool integration and instructor acceptance in authentic STEM settings remains limited. Prior work has explored different ways to evaluate the use of technology in STEM courses. For example, Nguyen et al. used a mixed method design to study how a learning analytics dashboard supported student progress in an engineering course [6]. Krause and Waters examined how clicker-based activities influenced engagement in large engineering classes [7]. To understand how students use educational tools, Henderson et al. suggested collecting both behavioral data and student self-reports to capture patterns of tool implementation and difficulties to use [8].

Students from different majors often enter required engineering courses with varied academic preparation, increasing instructional and assessment complexity in large classes [9]. Identifying teaching strategies that are broadly accepted across departments is therefore important for improving consistency and effectiveness in large STEM courses.

Assessment Framework Goals

This paper presents interview data and systematic analysis from 12 senior engineering faculty who have taught large classes (e.g., classes with 80 or more students enrolled), along with pre- and post-semester student survey results collected in Spring 2025 from a large undergraduate Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) course (n > 50). The goal is to develop a sustainable, community-informed framework to support student engagement and reduce faculty workload in large-enrollment engineering courses.

The study examines alignment between faculty-reported instructional intentions and student-reported expectations and experiences within shared instructional domains. Faculty participants were selected from multiple engineering majors to ensure balanced perspectives. Student surveys were administered at the beginning and end of the semester to capture changes over time. A unified interview protocol was used to ensure consistency across faculty interviews. Student participation was voluntary to protect privacy and encourage open feedback. The framework draws on prior work in active learning and instructional models for large classrooms. The evaluation focuses on whether student expectations are met and on identifying gaps that may not be recognized by instructors.

The paper includes three components: (1) analysis of faculty interviews, (2) comparison of pre- and post-semester student survey results, and (3) synthesis of alignment gaps with practical strategies transferable to other large engineering courses.

Study Design and Theoretical Framework

Improving teaching in large-enrollment engineering courses requires alignment among instructional goals, learning activities, assessments, and feedback structures [10], [11]. This study draws on established learning theories as analytical lenses while also recognizing their limitations in large-enrollment engineering course. Constructive alignment theory emphasizes coherence among intended learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment criteria, so that students focus on meaningful learning rather than grade-driven strategies [12], [13]. In large courses, maintaining this coherence is difficult due to scale, diverse student backgrounds, and multiple teaching assistants. Prior research shows that weak connections between activities and assessments can reduce students' perceptions of fairness and engagement [14]. Thus, understanding how students interpret the purpose of in-class activities is central to this study.

Expectancy–value theory suggests that students invest effort when they believe they can succeed and when activities connect clearly to valued outcomes such as exam performance [15]. However, students in large courses often report uncertainty about workload [16], which can lower motivation even when active learning strategies are used [5], [17]. Accordingly, this study examines student expectations through a pre-semester survey and evaluates alignment with instructional practices using a post-semester survey. The research design was further informed by feedback and self-regulated learning theories, which indicate that delayed feedback in large classes can hinder early identification of learning gaps [18], [19], [20]. Formative feedback research highlights the role of timely, structured feedback in supporting motivation and adjustment of learning strategies [21].

Specifically, constructive alignment informed faculty interview questions on alignment among objectives, activities, and assessments. Expectancy–value theory guided student survey items on grading transparency and activity purpose. Feedback and self-regulated learning theory shaped items related to feedback timing, clarity, and opportunities for adjustment.

Research Methodology

Participants and Context

This study was conducted at a large public research university in the United States and included two participant groups: STEM faculty instructors and students enrolled in one large-enrollment undergraduate ECE course.

A large-enrollment course was defined as one with 80 or more students registered in a single semester. Enrollment figures refer to the total number of students across all sections and delivery formats within that semester. Across courses represented in faculty interviews, enrollments ranged from approximately 80 to over 500 students. In cases exceeding 500 students, this reflected coordinated multi-section offerings supported by structured instructional teams, typically consisting of a lead instructor and teaching assistants.

Faculty participants were professors from multiple STEM departments, including ECE, computer science, and related engineering fields. Instructors were considered experienced if they had taught at least two offerings of a course enrolling 80 or more students or had multiple years of experience in high-enrollment settings. Most faculty had between 5 and 30 years of teaching experience, and several had delivered the same large course more than 10 times. Interviews were conducted individually and reflected cross-course teaching perspectives. Table 1 summarizes structural characteristics of the courses represented.

Table 1. Faculty Participants and Course Context

Characteristic	Description
Academic disciplines	Engineering and related STEM fields
Course levels	Undergraduate, graduate, and mixed-level courses
Typical enrollment range	Approximately 80–550 students per course
Instructional formats	In-person, hybrid, and online
Course role	Core or required courses; high-enrollment electives
Teaching team structure	Single instructor with undergraduate and/or graduate TAs
TA–student ratios	Approximately 1:40 to 1:100, depending on course and assessment model
Primary assessment models	Auto-graded assignments, rubric-based grading, and mixed approaches
Common instructional technologies	Learning management systems (LMS), auto-grading platforms, lecture recording, online discussion forums
Student support resources	TA office hours, tutoring centers, counseling services, early outreach mechanisms

Student participants were drawn from one large-enrollment undergraduate ECE course offered in Fall 2025. While faculty perspectives reflected multiple disciplines and course sizes, the student survey component was implemented within this single course over one semester. The surveyed course enrolled students from multiple ECE tracks, including electrical engineering and computer engineering pathways, and included some students with computing-focused interests. The course was primarily taken by upper-division undergraduates, although detailed distributions by academic year were not collected to preserve anonymity.

Faculty Interviews

To examine alignment between faculty instructional strategies and student experiences in large-enrollment engineering courses, Phase 1 focused on instructors' perspectives on teaching high-enrollment classes and related constraints. We conducted semi-structured interviews with faculty who had prior experience teaching courses enrolling 80 to 550 students. These courses were primarily undergraduate core or cross-listed undergraduate/graduate offerings. Small graduate seminars were not included in the high-enrollment analysis. Courses were delivered in in-person, hybrid, and online formats.

Interview questions were informed by prior research on large-class instruction and active learning and organized into six instructional domains: classroom engagement, grading transparency, feedback and turnaround time, TA coordination, technology and infrastructure use, and student support and well-being. Instructors described how they adjusted strategies across class sizes, coordinated TA teams, and balanced instructional efficiency with student support.

Faculty participants were recruited by email. A detailed protocol was shared in advance, and interviews were scheduled individually, typically lasting about 1 hour. 12 faculty members from engineering programs within the department participated. All interviews were conducted via Zoom and audio recorded with participant consent under prior Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (Approval No. 28278).

After each interview, a graduate researcher with CITI certification prepared a structured summary. Responses were organized by mapping each interview question to the corresponding faculty response to maintain alignment with the six predefined domains. These domains served as the initial coding framework for analysis. The interviewer reviewed the audio recordings alongside the summaries to verify completeness and accuracy. Any discrepancies were clarified during this verification process. Finalized summaries were anonymized prior to analysis, and an organized documentation trail of interview materials was maintained to support transparency and consistency.

Student Surveys

Survey items were developed to parallel the instructional domains identified in faculty interviews and were grounded in the same theoretical constructs. This alignment ensured that the survey questions captured the same dimensions explored in the interviews, allowing direct comparison between instructor intentions and student experiences. Pre- and post-semester surveys were administered to the same students, with the pre-survey distributed during the first weeks of class and the post-survey at the end of the semester. This paired design supported within-course comparisons over time and enabled analysis of alignment gaps in large enrollment engineering courses.

The surveys included Likert-scale items, multiple-choice questions, and short open-ended responses. Likert-scale items measured perceptions of grading clarity, feedback timeliness, engagement effectiveness, TA consistency, and workload stress. Multiple-choice items captured specific experiences, such as preferred feedback formats and sources of academic support. Open-ended prompts allowed students to explain challenges or highlight factors affecting motivation and stress. This mixed-format design enabled both quantitative comparison and qualitative contextual interpretation.

The study received IRB approval. Participation was voluntary for both faculty and students, with informed consent and no impact on course grades. Surveys were administered during a brief in-class break via an anonymous QR code to reduce response pressure and protect privacy, while minimizing disruption to normal course activities.

Data Analysis and Alignment Procedure

Alignment in this study refers to the consistency between faculty-reported instructional intentions within each instructional domain and aggregated student expectations and end-of-semester perceptions in that same domain. The predefined domains included classroom engagement, grading transparency, feedback timing, TA coordination, technology use, and student support.

Faculty interviews were organized by these domains according to the interview protocol. Interviews were documented using structured notes and summarized by domain. From these summaries, faculty intentions and reported implementation practices were extracted to represent the instructor design perspective for comparison. The study did not apply statistical testing. Alignment was assessed through structured domain-level comparison. Student survey items were designed to correspond to the same domains. Pre-semester responses captured baseline expectations, while post-semester responses reflected end-of-course perceptions. Survey results were analyzed at the aggregate level to identify recurring response patterns.

Alignment classification followed a predefined rule-based framework. A domain was considered aligned when student responses generally reflected faculty intentions and expectations were perceived as met; partially aligned when feedback indicated mixed experiences or remaining concerns; and misaligned when student responses suggested unmet expectations or perceptions inconsistent with faculty assumptions.

Open-ended survey responses were analyzed using a confirmatory domain-based coding approach aligned with the predefined instructional domains. Responses were grouped into recurring thematic categories within each domain. Because the qualitative component aimed to support domain-level interpretation, coding followed a structured confirmatory framework.

Coding and classification were conducted by the primary researcher to maintain consistency across domains. To enhance interpretive stability, a subset of responses was re-examined after initial categorization to verify category definitions and ensure that no new substantial themes emerged. This iterative review served as an internal consistency check to reduce classification drift.

Results and Discussion

Faculty Interview Results

Faculty participants represented courses ranging from approximately 80 to over 500 students, across lecture-based and hybrid formats. We examined whether reported challenges differed by course scale or delivery mode. Instructors teaching courses with 80–150 students described greater flexibility in using discussion-based or interactive activities. In contrast, those teaching courses with enrollments above 300 students emphasized scalability, automation, and structured TA coordination as primary operational concerns.

Despite these differences, several themes were consistent across contexts. Faculty at all enrollment levels stressed the need to align engagement activities with assessment, ensure grading consistency across TAs, and provide early, structured feedback. While logistical solutions varied by scale and format, the underlying alignment challenges were conceptually similar. These patterns are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Reported Strategies, Pain Points, and Support Needs in Large-Enrollment Courses

Domain	Reported Strategies	Reported Pain Points	Identified Support Needs
Instructional Design & Engagement	Micro-lectures with pauses; polling and think–pair–share; scaffolded projects; blank-space slides and guided derivations; real-world examples	Attention drops after 15–20 min; uneven participation; limited scalability of discussions; attendance decline in flipped/recorded formats	Engagement templates for large lectures; discipline-specific examples; guidance on scale-appropriate active learning
Assessment & Grading	Automated quizzes/homework; rubric-based TA grading; reduced subjectivity; staged project checkpoints; peer review	Hand grading not feasible; TA grading inconsistency; delayed feedback; assessment security risks	Access to auto-grading tools; shared rubrics; TA calibration training; policy support for assessment redesign
Student Support & Equity	Early alerts from homework/midterms; proactive email outreach; optional review materials; flexible deadlines; staged interventions	Variation in prior preparation; unnoticed academic decline; fairness vs flexibility tension; limited capacity for follow-up	Early-risk analytics; coordinated advising/tutoring; institutional guidelines for equitable flexibility

Technology Use	Learning Management System (LMS) as hub; polling tools; forums; lecture capture; coding platforms	Tool fragmentation; setup burden; learning curves; tech failures	Centralized tech support; LMS and grading integration; sustained support for high-enrollment courses
Teaching Assistant Coordination	Defined TA roles; lead-TA models; weekly meetings; shared rubrics/docs	High coordination load; uneven TA readiness; supervision burden	Adequate TA ratios; formal TA training; recognition of coordination workload
Student Well-being & Workload	Reminders and check-ins; extension tokens; workload calibration; counseling referrals	Stress from clustered deadlines; hard to detect mental health issues; rigor–compassion balance	Aligned workload policies; stronger campus support links; faculty guidance on trauma-informed teaching
Institutional & Professional Support	Faculty learning communities; teaching-center consultation; shared materials; small grants	Course redesign without continuity; limited time; low recognition of large-class teaching	Redesign support structures; material repositories; formal workload recognition

Faculty reported that active-learning strategies were effective only when their instructional purpose was explicit and directly connected to graded components. For example, tools such as live polling or online discussion platforms supported engagement when clearly tied to homework or exams, but participation declined when framed as optional. Project-based components were viewed positively when they replaced high-stakes exams but were less effective when simply added on top of traditional assessments.

Across courses, instructors relied on coordinated TA teams and centralized platforms to manage scale. Learning management systems were used for distributing materials and hosting auto-graded quizzes, while polling tools supported in-class response collection. Recording systems enabled review and hybrid access but were not sufficient to maintain engagement on their own. Asynchronous discussion platforms and automated grading tools reduced repetitive communication and grading load, but faculty emphasized that these systems required clearly defined TA roles and regular coordination meetings to function effectively. Institutional tutoring services were described as additional support for students with prerequisite gaps.

Overall, interviews suggest that tool selection alone does not determine instructional effectiveness in large-enrollment courses. Differences in course size and format influenced implementation strategies, but successful practice depended on structured coordination, transparent alignment with assessment, and clearly defined instructional roles. Course contexts are described in the methodology section.

Student Survey Results

Table 3 compares pre-semester expectations with post-semester reflections in a large-enrollment engineering course.

Table 3. Pre- and Post-Semester Student Feedback Summary

Dimension	Pre-Semester Expectation	Post-Semester Reflection
Grading clarity	Clear, predictable grading	Clearer grading; exam fairness concerns remain
Feedback timing	Early feedback	Early feedback valued; late feedback less impactful
Engagement activities	Grade-linked interaction	Valued when tied to assessment
TA support	Consistent answers	Inconsistent experiences
Workload balance	Flexible policies	Flexibility reduced stress and supported persistence

Students initially emphasized clear grading rules, early feedback, consistent TA support, assessment-linked activities, and reasonable flexibility. By the end of the semester, grading clarity and flexibility showed improvement, and early feedback was viewed as helpful when provided before major exams. Engagement activities were appreciated only when clearly connected to assessment. However, concerns about exam fairness and inconsistent TA responses remained. Overall, some instructional goals were recognized by students, but gaps in communication persisted.

Student–Faculty Alignment Analysis

Table 4. Student–Faculty Alignment Matrix

Instructional Domain	Faculty-Reported Intent (Interviews)	Pre-Semester Student Expectations	Post-Semester Student Experience	Alignment Summary
Classroom engagement	Short activities, polls, in-class problems to sustain attention	Want interaction if tied to grades or understanding	Activities valued when clearly connected to assessments	Partial alignment
Grading transparency	Clear rubrics, consistency across TAs, fairness	Strong expectation for predictable grading rules	Improved clarity, but concerns remain for exams	Partial alignment
Feedback and turnaround	Fast feedback via automation or TA grading	Expect timely feedback to adjust study strategies	Feedback valued when early; late feedback less useful	Partial alignment
TA coordination	Weekly meetings, shared rubrics, task delegation	Expect consistent grading and responses	Inconsistencies noted across sections in some courses	Partial alignment
Technology use	Tools to scale grading and communication	Expect tools to simplify learning, not add burden	Positive when tools were stable and purpose clear	Partial alignment
Student support and well-being	Early alerts, extensions, referrals to support services	Expect flexibility and recognition of workload stress	Strong appreciation for early outreach and flexibility	High alignment

Table 4 presents the student–faculty alignment matrix, summarizing the relationship between faculty instructional intentions and students' pre- and post-semester experiences across major instructional domains.

Overall, alignment was partial across most domains. However, student responses show that these efforts were perceived as effective only when implementation was consistent and clearly linked to assessment outcomes. For instance, engagement activities were positively evaluated when directly connected to graded components. In contrast, TA coordination and grading consistency remained concerns despite reported standardization efforts. The strongest alignment appeared in student support, where early outreach and workload flexibility were clearly recognized by students. These findings suggest that consistency and visibility of implementation strongly influence student perceptions in large-enrollment courses.

We further examined TA coordination patterns across courses and found that clear task allocation, shared grading rubrics, and regular team meetings were associated with improved student perceptions of grading fairness, although maintaining consistency under time constraints remained a challenge. Based on these observations, this study provides practical and lightweight implementation tools to support large-course instruction. These include a student mental health survey instrument (Appendix A), a structured TA coordination guide (Appendix B), and optional early-alert criteria for non-anonymous course contexts (Appendix C). Rather than ranking instructional strategies, the framework helps instructors identify potential misalignment during the semester and conduct early alignment checks without increasing workload. These resources are designed to integrate with existing course structures and support continuous improvement in large-enrollment engineering courses.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the framework relies primarily on self-reported faculty interviews and student surveys. While appropriate for examining expectations and perceived alignment, the analysis is descriptive and exploratory. It does not establish causal relationships between instructional strategies and learning outcomes. Future research could incorporate quantitative approaches, such as statistical testing of pre–post differences, subgroup comparisons, or regression analysis, to strengthen empirical validation.

Second, teaching assistants were not interviewed directly. TA-related practices were examined through faculty interviews because course coordination, grading policies, and instructional structures are typically designed and supervised by faculty. However, TAs interact frequently with students in large courses and may offer additional insight into implementation-level challenges. Future studies should include TA perspectives to provide a more comprehensive view of instructional alignment.

Third, although participating faculty represented different disciplines, course sizes, and levels of teaching experience, the study was conducted at a single institution. In addition, formal academic achievement indicators (e.g., GPA) and detailed subgroup information, such as academic year or prior preparation level, were not collected. As a result, the analysis does not examine how alignment perceptions vary across different student populations. It is possible that students with different levels of preparation interpret instructional practices differently. Future research should extend the framework across multiple institutions and incorporate subgroup-level analysis to examine whether alignment patterns differ systematically by course size or student population.

Finally, even when evidence-based teaching strategies are adopted, gaps may remain between instructional intentions and student experiences. Some of these gaps may reflect structural constraints inherent to large-enrollment courses. Future studies could combine classroom observation or learning analytics with self-reported data to enable triangulation and further strengthen the framework.

Conclusions

This study presents a structured framework to measure how alignment between instructor teaching intentions and student expectations evolves over time in large engineering courses. By combining faculty interviews with student survey data, the framework identifies which instructional strategies function effectively in large-class settings. The alignment matrix, TA calibration checklist, and early alert communication template provide practical tools that improve coordination, grading transparency, and timely student support without requiring additional resources.

Although limited to a specific institutional context, the framework offers a clear and adaptable model that can be extended through learning analytics, classroom observations, or assessment outcomes. This structured approach enables instructors to refine large-course teaching practices across semesters based on systematic feedback rather than informal adjustments.

Acknowledgment

The author thanks the faculty members who generously participated in interviews and shared their teaching experiences, including Dr. Cranos Williams, Dr. Edgar Lobaton, Dr. Ginger Yu, Dr. Chau-Wai Wong, Dr. Paul Franzon, Dr. Greg Bottomley, Dr. Laura Bottomley, Dr. James Mickle, Dr. Maria Mayorga, Dr. Alice Lee, Dr. Susan Carson, and Dr. Zakiya Leggett.

The author also thanks Dr. Chau-Wai Wong and Dr. Greg Bottomley for providing opportunities to engage in large-enrollment course instruction. The author is especially grateful to Dr. Laura Bottomley for her guidance on the IRB process and for her expertise in engineering education, which helped ensure the research quality.

This work was supported in part by the NC State Preparing the Professoriate (PTP) Program (2024–2025). The author appreciates Dr. Peter Harries and Dr. James Mulholland for their leadership.

Finally, the author expresses deepest gratitude to Dr. Cranos Williams for his continuous mentorship, encouragement, and unwavering support. His guidance has been essential to the development of this work and to the author’s growth in both research and teaching.

References

[1] Han, F., & Ellis, R. A. (2021). Predicting Students' Academic Performance by Their Online Learning Patterns in a Blended Course: To What Extent Is a Theory driven Approach and a Data driven Approach Consistent? Educational Technology & Society, 24(1), 191–204. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26977867

[2] Snyder JJ, Sloane JD, Dunk RDP, Wiles JR (2016) Peer-Led Team Learning Helps Minority Students Succeed. PLoS Biol 14(3): e1002398. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002398

[3] S. Freeman et al., "Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 111, no. 23, pp. 8410–8415, 2014.

[4] M. Stains et al., "Anatomy of STEM teaching in North American universities," Science, vol. 359, no. 6383, pp. 1468–1470, 2018.

[5] E. J. Theobald et al., "Active learning narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and math," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 117, no. 12, pp. 6476–6483, 2020.

[6] Nguyen, Q., Rienties, B., & Whitelock, D. (2020). A Mixed-Method Study of How Instructors Design for Learning in Online and Distance Education. J. Learn. Anal., 7, 64-78. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2020.73.6

[7] M. Martyn, "Clickers in the classroom: an active learning approach" Educause Q., 2 (2007), pp. 71-74

[8] Borrego, Maura, and Charles Henderson. "Increasing the use of evidence-based teaching in STEM higher education: A comparison of eight change strategies." Journal of Engineering Education 103.2 (2014): 220-252.

[9] Johnson, E. C.; Robbins, B. A.; Loui, M. C. What do students experience as peer leaders of learning teams? Adv. Eng. Educ. 2015, 1– 22

[10] Boev, O. V., Gruenwald, N., & Heitmann, G. (2014). Engineering curriculum design aligned with accreditation standards. Scholars' Press.

[11] Cropley, D. H., & Sitnikova, E. (2005). Teaching and learning in engineering education: Constructive alignment (Doctoral dissertation, School of Engineering, The University of Queensland).

[12] Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32(3), 347–364.

[13] Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for Quality Learning at University (4th ed.). Open University Press.

[14] Han, F., & Ellis, R. A. (2021). Patterns of student collaborative learning in blended course designs based on their learning orientations: A student approaches to learning perspective. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00303-9

[15] Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 109–132.

[16] Meaders, Clara L., A. Kelly Lane, Anya I. Morozov, J. Kenny Shuman, Emma S. Toth, Marilyne Stains, MacKenzie R. Stetzer, Erin Vinson, Brian A. Couch, and Michelle K. Smith. "Undergraduate student concerns in introductory STEM courses: What they are, how they change, and what influences them." Journal for STEM Education Research 3, no. 2 (2020): 195-216.

[17] Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. Journal of Engineering Education, 93(3), 223–231.

[18] Nicol, David J., and Debra Macfarlane-Dick. "Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice." Studies in higher education 31, no. 2 (2006): 199-218.

[19] Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64–70.

[20] Schunk, Dale H. "Self-regulated learning: The educational legacy of Paul R. Pintrich." Educational psychologist 40, no. 2 (2005): 85-94.

[21] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Student mental health survey forms

This appendix presents a brief, reusable survey instrument used to monitor student mental health indicators and course experience in large-enrollment engineering courses. The instrument is designed for weekly deployment and requires approximately one minute to complete.

Purpose

The purpose of this check-in is to obtain a rapid snapshot of student energy level, perceived course pace, and topic confidence, and to identify emerging support needs early in the semester.

Survey Items

1. Energy Level: How is your energy today?

😄 Very high 🙂 High 😐 Neutral 🙁 Low 😫 Very low

2. Perceived Course Pace: How does the course pace feel this week?

🏃 Too fast 🙂 Just right 🐢 Too slow

3. Topic Confidence: How confident do you feel about this week's topic?

5-point Likert scale ranging from Very low to Very high

4. Requested Support: What do you need from the teaching team this week? (Select all that apply)

☐ One-on-one office hour ☐ More worked examples ☐ Slow down the pace

☐ Speed up the pace ☐ Project clarification ☐ Note-taking strategies

☐ Help finding a study group ☐ Other (free response)

5. Open Comment (Optional): Anything else you would like us to know?

Deployment

The survey may be posted weekly using a learning management system (e.g., Moodle), online survey tools (e.g., Google Forms), or in-class response platforms. The instrument is anonymous by default. An optional contact code (e.g., initials plus a short numeric identifier) may be included only when follow-up outreach is planned.

Data Encoding and Reporting

Responses to Items 1–3 are mapped to a 5-point numeric scale for analysis. For each week, the following metrics are computed:

- Mean score for energy, pace, and confidence
- Percentage of responses in the bottom two categories

If the percentage of responses in the bottom two categories for energy or confidence exceeds 35 percent in each week, the instructional team issues a short course announcement and provides additional review or support resources.

Appendix B

Teaching Assistant Coordination and Support Guide

Purpose: This appendix outlines a structured TA coordination framework designed to ensure grading consistency, efficient student support, and predictable communication in large courses.

TA Roles and Responsibilities: A weekly Lead TA rotation is used.

Lead TA (weekly): Sets the agenda for the TA coordination meeting. Maintains grading rubrics and task boards. Tracks deadlines and identifies risks that require instructor attention.
Grading TAs: Apply the approved rubric consistently. Conduct sample audits of at least 10 percent of assigned grading. Report unclears rubric items to the Lead TA.
Office Hours TAs: Run office hours using a five-minute triage rule. Log common questions and misconceptions. Share brief notes after each office hours block.
Forum TA: Triages questions on Piazza or Discord. Merges duplicate posts and maintain the FAQ. Tags posts by topic and instructional week.
Lab or Review TA: Leads weekly practice or review sessions. Collects student muddy points and reports trends to the instructor.

Service Targets

- Forum responses within 24 hours on weekdays and 48 hours on weekends.
- Regrade decisions returned within five days.
- Office hours queue time no longer than ten minutes.

Weekly Coordination Schedule
Monday: 30-minute TA coordination meeting.
Wednesday: 15-minute rubric calibration session.
Friday: Short early signal check focused on missed work, low quiz scores, or repeated forum flags.

Rubric Calibration Process
Double grade a 10 percent sample. Discuss grading gaps and interpretation differences. Update rubric text and examples as needed. Proceed to full grading only after agreement is reached.

Office Hours Standard Operating Procedure
Use an intake sheet at entry. Apply color tags for concept questions, practice questions, and grading questions. Follow a 5-minute rotation rule. Encourage peer assistance after initial guidance.

Academic Integrity
Review the academic integrity policy before each assessment. Use secure testing when required. Require a regrade form with written justification. Document incidents in a shared TA log.

Accessibility and Accommodations
Implement DRC letters as specified. Adjust timing or provide quiet rooms when required. Provide captioned videos and alternative formats for course materials.

Communication Templates
Welcome message (Week 1)
Explains where to ask questions, office hours schedules, and how to prepare.
Early alert message
Sent when a student misses two or more items or scores below 60 percent on two quizzes. Includes support options such as office hours, review videos, and practice sets.
Encouragement message
Sent after the midterm to acknowledge progress and outline next steps.
Escalation Protocol
Safety or well-being concerns are reported to the instructor and campus CARE resources. Repeated academic misconduct is escalated to the instructor and department.

Appendix C

Early-Alert Heuristics (optional if not anonymous)

This appendix describes optional early-alert criteria used when student identity is available.

Flag a student for gentle outreach if any two hold in the same week:
- Missed ≥1 assignment and last quiz <60%
- Two consecutive low-energy or low-confidence responses
- Zero forum activity and no office hour visits

Standardized Outreach Message
"We noticed you may be experiencing difficulty. Here are three quick options to help you get back on track:
(1) a 15-minute office hour slot,
(2) a two-page set of worked examples, or
(3) a short practice problem set.
Please reply with 1, 2, or 3."