**A framework for Building Information Modeling
implementation in engineering education**

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering</i>
Manuscript ID	cjce-2018-0047.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Boton, Conrad; Ecole de technologie superieure, Forgues, Daniel; Ecole de Technologie Superieure, Genie de la Construction; Halin, Gilles; Université de Lorraine
Keyword:	Building Information Modeling, Engineering Education Research, Theoretical framework, Curriculum development
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 **A framework for Building Information Modeling implementation in**
2 **engineering education**

3 Conrad Boton¹, Daniel Forgues¹, Gilles Halin²

4 ¹ *Department of Construction Engineering, Ecole de Technologie Supérieure, Montréal,*
5 *Canada*

6 1100, rue Notre-Dame Ouest, Montréal (Québec) H3C 1K3, Téléphone : 514 396-8800,
7 E-mail : conrad.boton@etsmtl.ca

8 ² *UMR MAP n°3495, CNRS, University of Lorraine, Nancy, France.*

9

Draft

A framework for Building Information Modeling implementation in engineering education

Abstract

Universities are facing many challenges to their efforts to introduce Building Information Modeling (BIM) in engineering education. Many research efforts have been dedicated to the subject and addressed some specific aspects of the issue. Thus, there is no comprehensive framework to provide decision makers with practical and neutral guidelines. The framework proposed in this paper identifies the main challenges to address. A case study from a Canadian engineering school is used to evaluate and to validate the proposed framework, and to illustrate the challenges. The strategy of integrating BIM in engineering education should be based on the specific skills the students are expected to acquire. It is then possible to define the appropriate teaching approaches. An effective implementation strategy should be gradual in order to progressively raise community awareness, learn from mistakes and identify best practices. A particular emphasis should be placed on the needs of the local industry.

Keywords:

BIM; Engineering Education Research; Theoretical framework, Curriculum Development; Decision-making

32 **1. Introduction**

33 Building Information Modeling (BIM) is a disruptive approach which is dramatically
34 changing the way construction projects are designed, managed and built. It uses a
35 multidisciplinary object-oriented 3D model of the constructed facility in order to
36 improve and to document its design and to simulate different aspects of its construction
37 or its operation. Many research works (Eastman et al. 2011; Kreider & Messner 2013)
38 have addressed BIMs potential to improve productivity in the industry. Traditionally,
39 the construction sector is characterised by a low rate of productivity compared to other
40 similar industries (automotive, aerospace, etc.) (Egan 1998; Haas et al. 1999; Pekuri et
41 al. 2011). While many studies have shown the added value of BIM, Architecture,
42 Engineering and Construction (AEC) firms are facing many challenges in their BIM
43 implementation experience. Among the main challenges (mostly related to technologies,
44 organisation and policies) is the lack of well-trained personnel that firms can rely on
45 when implementing BIM (Sacks & Barak 2010). The truth is that the crisis in training is
46 not really new in the construction industry (Egan 1998), and the face of the engineering
47 education is being changed by the combination of two related movements: the
48 technological movement (to overcome the related information flow and the physical
49 barriers) and the ideological movement to remove the man-made and artificial barriers
50 (Lowell Bishop & Verleger 2013).

51 With the rise of the BIM approach in the construction industry, a particular
52 emphasis is being made on the technological movement, and the question of training
53 and education has taken a new level of importance in the sector. Indeed, beyond the
54 usual training needs, new needs arise with the arrival of this new technological
55 approach and new operational roles in construction projects. Barison and Santos

56 (2010a) inventoried some of these new roles and responsibilities. Only a few years ago,
57 these roles were very software-oriented, but they are gradually changing towards more
58 emphasis on management needs (Botton & Forgues 2015). An interesting outcome from
59 the work of Barison and Santos (2010a) is that these roles are not simply related to
60 technical competencies, but they also involve integration and leadership-related aspects.
61 For example, “the main function of a BIM Manager is to manage people in the
62 implementation and/or maintenance of the BIM process” and a BIM facilitator has the
63 responsibility of assisting other professionals and usually is charged with improving the
64 communication between the engineer and the foremen or contractors (Barison & Santos
65 2010a).

66 As shown by the recent BIM Academic Symposium series (Issa 2016), for a
67 successful BIM introduction in their curricula, universities are facing major dilemmas.
68 One important dilemma is related to the fact that curricula in the AEC sector are based
69 on today’s practices, but “AEC education should be adapting, and structured to evolve
70 to address present and future challenges” (Becerik-Gerber et al. 2011). While practices
71 have evolved towards more integration in the aerospace and automotive industries, the
72 construction sector continues to have very low rates of IT adoption (Attar & Sweis
73 2010; Jupp & Nepal 2014; Nikas et al. 2007). The processes are therefore very similar
74 to those of the past. As it is based on these processes, AEC curricula seem to be looking
75 backwards instead of looking forward. Moreover, people who are responsible for such
76 curricula in the universities are generally not aware of what BIM is and the challenges it
77 brings to the industry. It is usually considered simplistically that BIM is in contradiction
78 with current practices, and deciding to implement it in curricula is equated to choosing
79 between the present and a possible future. The most current decision consists of
80 splitting the difference and to propose some isolated BIM courses. Another dilemma

then appears: educating software specialists with advanced technological skills, or forming managers with procedural skills and less technical competencies. Indeed, due to the large variety of roles and responsibilities BIM specialists must be prepared to deal with (Barison & Santos 2010a) and the necessary balance between technology, organisation and processes (Boton & Forgues 2015), it is challenging for universities to find a middle ground.

Although many research works have been dedicated to proposing a framework for different aspects of BIM implementation in education (Kocaturk & Kiviniemi 2013; Macdonald 2011; Sacks & Pikas 2013; Shelbourn et al. 2016; Succar & Sher 2013), no comprehensive framework has been proposed to support BIM introduction in engineering universities, nor to assist researchers in their comparison work. This paper presents a framework of BIM introduction in engineering education. It first discusses the existing strategies and the skills expected from BIM in education. It then proposes a framework with its main constituting elements. Based on the case of an engineering university in Canada, it finally shows how such framework can be used to advance both education and research in BIM.

2. Which Approaches for which Skills in AEC?

2.1 Teaching approaches in engineering

The lecturer-centred “chalk and talk” format has remained the dominant pedagogy approach in engineering teaching, and many accreditation criteria are based on “what is being taught” (Mills & Treagust 2003). However, many criticisms have been raised about the effectiveness of such an approach (Char & Collier 2015) including the lack of integration with industrial practices, the lack of teamwork and communication skills necessary for graduates, the insufficient design experience provided to students, the low

105 level of awareness of the reality of modern engineering practices, the inadequate
106 relation between theory and practice, and the use of outdated learning strategies as
107 identified by Mills and Treagust (2003). Moreover, according to Lowell Bishop and
108 Verleger (2013), it is generally difficult to teach and assess many of the criterion
109 required by the accreditation organizations such as the Accreditation Board for
110 Engineering and Technology (ABET) or the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board
111 (CEAB) with “informative lectures and closed form questions”.

112 To overcome these criticisms and limits, new approaches have emerged during
113 the last decades, with a student-centred approach and more emphasis on “what is being
114 learned”. One of the most well-known is Project-Based Learning (PBL). PBL is defined
115 as “a comprehensive approach to classroom teaching and learning that is designed to
116 engage students in investigating authentic problems” (Blumenfeld et al. 1991). It
117 encompasses subject courses and project-organised curriculum (throughout a
118 curriculum), and should be differentiated from project-oriented studies (in individual
119 courses) (Heitmann 1996). A variant of PBL is Problem-Based Learning. Very similar
120 to Project-Based Learning, it originated at McMaster University in Canada and has been
121 extensively used in medical education (Kilroy 2003). Problem-based learning uses a set
122 of problems as the starting point of the process of learning, and skills training and
123 lectures are designed to support the process (Perrenet et al. 2000). Perrenet et al. (2000)
124 has explored how suitable this approach is for engineering education, and concluded
125 that it can be a successful approach for engineering teaching. According to De Graaff
126 (2013), different types of PBL exist, and in order to choose the most appropriate one
127 and fully take advantage of it, it is important to clearly identify “the way the problem is
128 presented to the students, the role of the teachers, the timespan allotted for working on the

129 problem, etc.” It is also crucial to determine if PBL “is concentrated in isolated projects or
130 it is considered a leading principle throughout the curriculum” (Graaff 2013).

131 Another interesting approach is the Flipped (or Inverted) Classroom. In this
132 approach, instead of giving lectures inside the class and practice exercises and problem-
133 solving outside the class, “the events that have traditionally taken place inside the
134 classroom now take place outside the classroom and vice-versa” (Lage et al. 2000).
135 Practice exercises and problem-solving are then used inside the classroom and video
136 lectures are proposed outside the class (Lowell Bishop & Verleger 2013).

137 Even though the discussion proposed by Mills and Treagust (2003) showed that
138 the best approach to teach engineering should be a mix of “chalk and talk” and Project-
139 Based Learning and Problem-Based Learning, it is still not clear for academia actors
140 what is the best strategy and timing for introducing technology-based innovation such
141 as BIM in their curricula. In addition to the implementation strategies, the question of
142 the competencies students are supposed to acquire with regard to industry’s needs is
143 critical and constantly evolving.

144 ***2.2 What skills are we expecting students to learn from BIM?***

145 Whatever these strategies are, the choice depends primarily on the need for training in
146 the industry. Thus, the integration of new technologies in construction education should
147 preliminarily be discussed among professional institutions (Horne 2006). In its report on
148 Integrated Practice dedicated to integrative education, the American Society of
149 Architects (AIA) identified BIM as “a catalyst to rethink architectural education”
150 (Cheng 2006). The idea is to anticipate new demands while keeping core design skills
151 which will remain of extreme importance. In this context, Barison and Santos (2010b)
152 proposes three levels of BIM specialists to be trained: introductory (BIM modeller),
153 intermediary (BIM analyst) and advanced (BIM manager). While this approach is

154 clearly interesting to complement the strategies proposed by Horne (2006), it does not
155 seem sufficient to cover the question of skills raised by the AIA's report. Indeed, the
156 proposal seems too generic, lacking the appropriate level of detail required to serve as a
157 helpful guideline for universities.

158 In fact, "the short-term goals for the course can be stated in terms of the set of
159 skills to be acquired by students, for engineering communication in general and for BIM
160 in particular" (Sacks & Barak 2010). Based on a BIM course at Technion University,
161 Sacks and Barak (2010) identified some specific skills that can be expected of students:
162 modeling the structure of a building with relevant object selection, associating objects
163 with the correct semantic relationships, production of views from the manipulation of
164 the model, structural drawing production with all the required information, and model-
165 based quantity take-off. Such skills are clearer and more in line with the generic skills
166 expected from an engineering curriculum. Furthermore, while aiming to provide a
167 comprehensive education, engineering bachelor degree programs are commonly facing
168 the challenge related to the maximum number of credits (Sacks & Barak 2010).
169 Introducing a new course is thus a complicated affair. The first approach to overcome
170 such a situation is to propose optional courses while proposing new dedicated programs
171 at the postgraduate level. However, in order to meet the industry's needs (see section
172 3.4.3) and to ensure a significant impact, it is imperative to find an intermediary way to
173 progressively introduce the different aspects of BIM education by overcoming the main
174 challenges they raise.

175 ***2.3 Main Challenges of BIM Integration in Engineering Education***

176 With an architecture-oriented perspective, Kocaturk and Kiviniemi (2013) proposed a
177 discussion of the challenges related to the integration of BIM in education. The
178 discussion is about two major aspects to address: modeling and representation, and

179 collaborative work. They identified some critical cognitive and pedagogical issues to
180 address including new technology and working methods, and individual and distributed
181 cognition. They also noted that BIM education should address the new services and
182 specialisation currently high in demand in the industry, and the importance for
183 education to not only follow BIM, but to “become one of the driving forces in this
184 industry transformation” (Kocaturk & Kiviniemi 2013). Becerik-Gerber et al. (2011)
185 identified the limiting factors for not incorporating BIM into education programs. It
186 appeared that the primary reason was the lack of people qualified to teach BIM (55% of
187 surveyed programs). The other reasons are related to the lack of adequate resources to
188 make the change (45%), the lack of appropriate space (36%), the fact that BIM is not an
189 accreditation criterion (27%), etc.

190 Based on multiple research efforts (Barison & Santos 2010b; Goedert et al.
191 2011; Horne 2006; Kocaturk & Kiviniemi 2013; Sacks & Pikas 2013), we can
192 summarize the challenges related to BIM education into seven main groups: the skills to
193 acquire, the teaching approach, the evaluation methods, the technological environment,
194 the industrial partnerships, the implementation approach and the timing. Some
195 frameworks have been proposed in the literature. Each framework addresses some of
196 these challenges, as shown in Table 1. In 2010, Barison and Santos (2010b) proposed a
197 review of the existing strategies for planning a BIM curriculum. Using a Content
198 Analysis methodology, they analysed the reported experience of the leading schools in
199 BIM education. The framework they propose categorizes BIM specialists, prerequisites,
200 BIM course categories and each project’s BIM model into one of three levels:
201 introductory, intermediary and advanced. They also briefly discussed the schools’
202 teaching and evaluation methods. Assuming that “BIM is not just a new topic to be
203 added to the existing curriculum”, the framework presented by Kocaturk and Kiviniemi

(2013) proposes a progressive and gradual integration of BIM, but is dedicated more to architecture schools. Their framework focuses on the model and the representation, and also on the tools, the issues and the methods for efficient collaborative work. The technological environment, the timing and the cognitive implications are particularly well discussed. Macdonald (2011) proposed the “IMAC” framework, dedicated to collaborative BIM education. The aim is to assist BIM teachers to benchmark their curricula and to find the best strategies to improve them. The IMAC framework consists of four stages corresponding to the identified levels of achievement in the use of BIM models. Macdonald’s framework proposes a mapping exercise of the existing courses in Australian universities, focusing on building technology, environment, management, IT and specialised aspects. Sacks and Pikas (2013) propose an elicitation of the requirements of BIM education requirements and the levels of achievement and topics that are necessary for each degree program. A total of 39 topics were identified and regrouped in three main topics. Succar and Sher (2013) tried to inventory the core BIM competencies that universities and engineering schools must teach in order to cover the needs of the industry. Thus, based on the same Australian context, they proposed a BIM education framework including a conceptual workflow with the identification, classification and aggregation of the different items of BIM competency. The framework proposed by Goedert et al. (2011) focuses on virtual construction education and game-based simulation. It applies automated inference principles as a means to provide situation-specific simulations. A residential project was used as proof of concept. Kim (2012) introduced an innovative and integrated approach for teaching BIM. That approach combines 2D drawings and 3D BIM models to present and understand the construction details, as well as for quantity take-off. The paper illustrates how BIM can be an effective “integrated learning tool in construction education.” Very

recently, Shelbourn et al. (2016) developed a BIM education framework. Their proposed framework is intended to be international and is dedicated to the higher education sector. It is an improvement of the “IMAC” framework (Macdonald 2011) with a case study showing how it can be used.

References	SKILLS	TEACHING APPROACH			IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY			Formalized proposals
	Skills to acquire	Teaching methods	Evaluation methods	Technological environment	Industrial partnerships	Implementation approach	Timing	
(Barison & Santos, 2010b)	X	X	X					
(Kocaturk & Kiviniemi, 2013)	X			X			X	
(Macdonald, 2011)		X	X					X
(Sacks & Pikas, 2013)	X			X				
(Succar & Sher, 2013)	X				X	X		X
(Goedert et al., 2011)				X				X
(Kim, 2012)	X		X				X	X
(Shelbourn et al., 2016)			X	X			X	

Table 1. A comparison of existing frameworks for incorporating BIM in curriculum

As can be seen from Table 1 and from the overview presented above, none of these frameworks covers all the required aspects. However, it is important both for universities and researchers to provide a comprehensive framework that can enable them to incorporate BIM in education as well as to evaluate and compare the existing BIM programs.

3 A Framework for BIM Introduction in Engineering

Education

3.1 Overview of the framework

The proposed framework considers the main challenges identified above. It is composed of three main dimensions representing the three main aspects to consider when

introducing BIM in university curriculums: the skills to be acquired by students, the teaching approach to adopt and the implementation strategy. The main elements of the framework are depicted in Figure 1 and discussed in the following sections.

Figure 1: Main elements of the proposed framework

3.2 The skills to be acquired

The first element to consider when introducing BIM in AEC is the skills to be acquired by the students. In the proposed framework, the skills cover both the core competencies as developed in existing engineering competency models and the BIM-specific knowledge which encompasses the technologies, the processes and the policies related to BIM. The skills to be acquired also depend on the need for training in the industry, and for BIM introduction purposes, universities need to define the level of education, the core competencies needed, and the targeted BIM-specific knowledge.

262 3.2.1 *The level of education*

263 The level of education here is similar to the “level of a BIM course” introduced by
264 Barison and Santos (2010b). It determines the level at which BIM is taught in a course
265 or a curriculum and identifies three levels: introductory, intermediary and advanced.
266 The introductory level corresponds to BIM modelers’ training, while BIM analysts and
267 BIM managers are trained respectively at the intermediary and advanced levels. They
268 also proposed three BIM course categories for the three levels: “digital graphic
269 representation”, integrated design studio and interdisciplinary design studio. While this
270 is a very interesting starting point, the proposal does not seem sufficient to provide a
271 good understanding of what should be the content of each level. Moreover, these
272 authors implicitly suggest project-based learning as an appropriate strategy for all three
273 levels. Finally, the BIM specialists to be formed at each level do not seem consistent
274 according to the findings of the same authors about the role of BIM specialists (Barison
275 & Santos 2010a). We will see in the next sections that defining the level of education
276 and the types of specialists to be formed is more complex and should comprise an
277 appropriate balance between modeling skills, management skills and theory/standards
278 knowledge.

279 In this framework, we consider that the level of education is related to the
280 academic level. Universities have to decide whether they will integrate BIM in bachelor
281 or postgraduate degree programs, or both. The objective is not the same for each level.
282 Based on the definition and the roles of the different BIM specialists identified by
283 Barison and Santos (2010a), it seems consistent for universities to train BIM modelers,
284 BIM facilitators and BIM software developers at the bachelor degree level. BIM
285 managers, BIM analysts and BIM consultants can be trained at the master degree level.

286 Finally, Ph.D. and other doctorate and post-doctorate degrees would be the best
287 programs to form BIM researchers or BIM-specialized consultants.

288 3.2.2 Core competencies

289 In Canada, the engineering programs' accreditation system introduced by the
290 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) uses 12 graduate attributes
291 including Knowledgebase for engineering, problem analysis, investigation, design, use
292 of engineering tools, individual and team work, communication skills, professionalism,
293 impact of engineering on society and the environment, ethics and equity, economics and
294 project management, life-long learning (Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board
295 2017). The recent engineering competency model proposed by the United States
296 Department of Labor identifies different tiers of competency (Employment and Training
297 Administration, 2015): personal effectiveness competencies (PEC), academic
298 competencies (AC), workplace competencies (WPC), industry-wide technical
299 competencies (IWTC), and Industry-sector technical competencies (ISTC). The first
300 three competencies (PEC, AC, and WPC) are referred to as "foundational
301 competencies". PEC refers to "soft skills", generally personal and learned at home,
302 while AC are thinking styles and cognitive functions that are useful for all occupations
303 and industries. WPC are related to self-management and interpersonal skills applicable
304 to many industries and occupations. The fourth (IWTC) and the fifth (ISTC)
305 competencies are industry-specific. IWTC cover the competencies that are useful for
306 actors across the industry, while ISTC are specific to an industry-particular sector. BIM
307 education should prioritize these last two competencies; depending on the level of
308 education, the level of importance of BIM is not the same. Accordingly, its role in the
309 core competencies will vary.

310 The bachelor degree level is where engineering core competencies are expected
311 to be acquired, both foundational and industry-specific competencies. At this level, a
312 particular emphasis should be placed on how BIM is taught as a support to industry
313 practices. Each use of BIM should be carefully related to the traditional practices it is
314 designed to improve. For example, 4D simulation should not be taught as a stand-alone
315 course but as a part of a construction planning and scheduling course. In the same way,
316 5D costing applications should be integrated in budgeting and costing lessons in order
317 to show the underlying links with the outcomes expected by industry practices such as
318 quantity take-off, bill of quantities, invoices, etc. A list of BIM uses and their associated
319 project phases has been proposed by Pennsylvania State University (Kreider & Messner
320 2013). The recurrent collaboration issues and how BIM can help in addressing them
321 should also be taught to students, without going deeper in the understanding of complex
322 BIM underlying theoretical concepts. At the master degree level, emphasis should be
323 placed on stand-alone BIM modules, with particular attention to the interdisciplinary
324 aspects of construction projects and recurrent collaboration issues. The aim is to deepen
325 particular aspects of BIM, while also stimulating the interest of students in the search
326 for sustainable solutions. The underlying theoretical concepts of BIM and the current
327 technological barriers should be taught to student in order to provide them with a good
328 understanding of the state of the art of the development of the BIM approach and the
329 main issues in the industry.

330 It is important to note here that the universities cannot define the core
331 competencies needed on their own. Indeed, advancements in construction processes are
332 led by the industry, not the academia. Therefore, core competencies need to be set in
333 close collaboration with industry. The necessary bi-directional interaction between the
334 industry and universities is discussed below (section 3.4.3).

3.2.3 BIM-specific knowledge

Unlike Computer-Aided Design (CAD), BIM is considered as a disruptive technology (Eastman et al., 2011). Indeed, while CAD has merely reproduced on computers the traditional practices and accelerated their realization, BIM is supposed to change the paradigm of construction projects' organization. Therefore, if it is important to integrate BIM as a support of the core competencies identified above, it is also important to teach BIM-specific knowledge. These competencies can be categorized into three main groups: technology-related, process-related and policy-related competencies (Succar 2009). According to Succar (2009), technology encompasses BIM software, model servers, equipment and peripherals, database technologies, geographic information systems and other communication systems. The process-related competencies include the information exchange processes between the different project actors in order to build the BIM models or to extract and reuse the drawings', documents' or other components' information. The policies deal with regulations, guidelines and contractual arrangements, as well as building standards, educational programs and best practices (Succar 2009). From a technological point of view, Sacks and Barak (2010) offer a list of BIM-specific knowledge expected from a bachelor degree BIM course, including the ability to: accurately model the structure of a building and to select the adapted objects; create the appropriate semantic connections and other relationships between the model's objects; generate different views for different purposes by manipulating the model; extract drawing with all the required information; and to extract a quantity take-off and other documents from the model.

In the proposed framework, we consider three main BIM-specific knowledge: modeling skills, management skills and theory/standards knowledge. Modeling skills are technology-related competencies, management skills are linked to process-related

360 competencies, and theory/standards skills are related to policies. These skills are not
361 expected in the same proportion for all BIM specialists. Based on the BIM specialists’
362 roles identified by Barison and Santos (2010a), Figure 2 proposes a distribution of the
363 weight of the different BIM-specific knowledge expected for the different roles.

364
365 Figure 2: A distribution of the weights of BIM-specific knowledge expected for
366 different BIM specialists

367 **3.3 The teaching approach**

368 The teaching approach includes the teaching methods, the evaluation methods and the
369 technological environment.

370 **3.3.1 The teaching methods**

371 The teaching method is critical for the success of BIM education. To ensure the
372 effectiveness of BIM education, it is important to find a good balance between teacher-
373 centred and student-centred learning approaches. This means that interactive classroom
374 activities should be mixed with the classic “chalk and talk” approach. For example, at
375 the bachelor degree level, “chalk and talk” can remain preponderant, but only with a
376 good dose of Project-Based Learning methods. These activities can encompass case

377 studies, modeling exercises, and thematic discussions. According to Bishop & Verleger
378 (2013), PBL methods can be very effective at achieving the ABET criteria, but flipped
379 classrooms should also be encouraged to ensure a good balance between theory and
380 practice. To successfully introduce PBL, it can be very helpful to follow the ten
381 checkpoints proposed by De Graaff (2013). These checkpoints include starting the
382 learning process with a problem, which can take the form of a project, a phenomenon or
383 a case. Skills and knowledge from different disciplines should be integrated into the
384 problem. This can be especially useful for illustrating the interoperability issues and the
385 need for collaboration in BIM processes. Each student is encouraged to formulate
386 his/her learning objectives and processes, but the collaboration of students regrouped in
387 teams is also necessary. It is especially valuable for students to learn from their failures
388 and utilize continuous feedback from the teacher to improve their learning experience.

389 In the case of BIM stand-alone courses, it is important to ensure that the teacher
390 has BIM Teaching Knowledge (BTK). As shown in Figure 3, BTK is at the intersection
391 of three interlocking knowledge areas: BIM software knowledge, BIM standards and
392 policies knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge. According to the competencies
393 expected by students from the course, priority should be put on BIM software and
394 pedagogical knowledge or BIM standards and pedagogical knowledge.

395

396 Figure 3: Venn diagram of BIM Teaching Knowledge

397 3.3.2 The evaluation methods

398 To assess students' learning, two main approaches are used: summative evaluation and
399 formative evaluation (Bloom et al. 1971). In summative assessment, which generally
400 takes place at the end of an instructional section (in the form of a final project,
401 judgement or exam, with a high point value), the students' learning is evaluated in order
402 to compare it to some defined standards. Among the existing methods for summative
403 assessment, we can cite testing, observation report, students' interview or survey,
404 multiple-choice questionnaire, and oral presentation or final project. Formative
405 evaluation aims at providing some useful feedback in order to improve both the
406 teaching and the learning processes.

407 The assessment procedures should be “designed to stimulate the learning”
408 (Graaff 2013) while evaluating the skills gained by the students. But, evaluation is
409 particularly challenging in BIM education, because unlike other subjects, it is not easy
410 to test the competence gained by students with an exam in which software are operated
411 (Sacks & Barak 2010). However, determining which skills have been acquired by
412 students is crucial (Barison & Santos 2010b). Modeling exercises and tests could be
413 complementary to the exam itself as a means to evaluate the level of learning (Barison
414 & Santos 2010b; Sacks & Barak 2010). According to the main course objective (BIM
415 technology or BIM management) and the number of students, appropriate evaluation
416 methods should be used, as proposed on Figure 4. For example, an emphasis can be put
417 on modeling exercises when BIM technology learning is the main aim and the number
418 of students is not very high.

419

Figure 4: Evaluation methods according to the objective and the number of students

Because of the innovative nature of BIM courses, it is important to also use diagnostic assessment. The aim is to not only to evaluate the teaching, but to be able to continuously evaluate the teaching experience in order to improve it and to adapt it to current practices. Moreover, the results of such diagnostic assessment can give a good idea of the students' perception, which science teachers can use to inform their teaching (Treagust 1995).

3.3.3 The Technological Environment

While the technological environment is critical for the success of a BIM curriculum, it is not limited to mastering the current software. Indeed, as recently shown by Liu and Berumen, technology is rapidly evolving; throughout their careers as BIM professionals, students will have to adapt to new technologies (Liu & Berumen 2016),

434 making “the ability to evaluate technologies, make wise decisions and choose the
435 appropriate technology to use [is] more important than mastering the current software”
436 (Liu & Berumen 2016). More emphasis should be placed on teaching the principles
437 underlying the software, by comparing different solutions from different vendors and
438 specialties, and by practicing the interoperability between them, based on real projects
439 or realistic scenarios and examples.

440 A particular focus should be on open source technologies in order to contribute
441 to the development of the OpenBIM initiative. It should be recalled that the
442 BuildingSMART association and several CAD software vendors launched the OpenBIM
443 initiative in 2012 as a way to increase the visibility of BIM and integrated process
444 through more interoperability. Promoting OpenBIM and similar initiatives is important
445 as it is a way for universities to maintain a neutral approach in the choice of the BIM
446 software, and to encourage the use of neutral interoperability formats (such as IFC) in
447 order to improve the collaboration practices in a sustainable way.

448 ***3.4 The Implementation Strategy***

449 The implementation strategy is related to the implementation approach, the timing and
450 the necessary industrial partnerships.

451 ***3.4.1 The Implementation Approach***

452 In 2006, Horne identified three main approaches to introduce IT into the construction
453 academic curriculum: modular, progression and integration.

454 In a modular approach, a stand-alone module is incorporated into the program
455 (Horne 2006). This strategy provides a good entry point for universities, who can
456 provide a better awareness of a promising technology without taking much risk, while
457 assessing the real potential, stability and potential it has for the industry. A typical

example of this strategy is the seminal example of Stanford in 1993 with the course Computer Integrated Architecture, Engineering and Construction (Fruchter 1999). Another example is reported by Kubicki and Boton (2011) on the use of 4D simulation to teach the structural principles of high-rise buildings at the University of Liège.

The progression strategy selects and introduces appropriate new software into the different years of the curriculum. The advantage of this strategy is to gradually integrate IT with a curriculum while ensuring that the students assimilate the underlying and related concepts so as to easily associate the theory with IT practice. To illustrate this approach, Horne (2006) gave the example of the School of the Built Environment at Northumbria University, where 2D CAD, a BIM tool (Revit) and its uses (design, energy analysis, costing, etc.) are gradually incorporated from year 1 to year 4. Note that year 3 is spent in industry in order to experience industry practices and challenges.

The integration strategy usually comes after the two previous ones and inserts complementary elements of IT throughout the university modules. In this approach, elements of the BIM approach are introduced into a large proportion of modules throughout the curriculum. Such an approach should be the ultimate goal of incorporating BIM in the curriculum. BIM can then be used as an axis with which to integrate the academic curriculum. It provides an interesting way to facilitate academic integration (Horne 2006), as suggested by the AIA's report on integrative education (Cheng 2006). It is also a good way to make the link between current practices and innovative uses. The BIM education approach used by Pennsylvania State University illustrates this integration approach (Messner n.d.).

3.4.2 *Timing*

Timing is a crucial aspect in the integration of BIM in education. An ideal integration should be gradual and make a progressive and complementary use of the various

483 implementation strategies outlined above. We propose to start with standalone modules,
484 so as to develop awareness, and then continue with a progression approach, before
485 reaching a full integration. This progressive strategy allows the possible feedback that
486 may come from students or other stakeholders from the education system to be acquired
487 and incorporated. Among other benefits, it is important to progressively obtain and
488 maintain the support of third parties responsible for the management of education
489 systems.

490 A phased integration also helps to gradually develop common responses to
491 important issues raised recently by Faust (2016), namely:

- 492 • Is BIM really sustainable or just a “fashion effect”?
- 493 • Is there a need for BIM in the local market?
- 494 • What are the specific needs of the local industry?
- 495 • Where an undergraduate program can encompass a BIM curriculum?

496 Providing answers to these questions makes it possible to establish a good policy
497 of continuous improvement, as well as an effective and long-term collaboration with
498 industry to better meet their needs.

499 *3.4.3 The Industrial Partnership*

500 As stated by Kocaturk and Kiviniemi (2013), there is an increasingly high demand for
501 new specialisations related to BIM in the construction industry. Because “one size does
502 not fit all” (Kocaturk & Kiviniemi 2013), it is important to work closely with industry
503 in order to understand its particular needs. It is then possible to ensure that the BIM
504 program is really adapted to these needs. In general, partnerships between universities
505 and architecture, and engineering and construction (AEC) firms can benefit both parties.
506 Indeed, the firms can provide universities with a good understanding of their needs as

507 well as identifying research issues, funding opportunities, case studies, job opportunities
508 and even some experienced lecturers. In return, the industry can take advantage of the
509 high-qualified staff resulting from the education programs, the trainees, the
510 technological watch, the research and development (R&D) resources from the
511 universities (Figure 5). An example of industry/academia partnership is described by
512 Succar and Sher (Succar & Sher 2013). Moreover, based on the study of the Irish BIM
513 education context, Hore et al. (2016) have recently demonstrated the benefits of a good
514 collaboration between education institutions.

515

516 Figure 5: Bi-directional interaction between industry and university

517

518

519 **4. Evaluation and validation of the proposed framework**

520 The method used for the development of the proposed framework is inspired by Design
521 Science approach (March & Smith 1995; Hevner et al. 2004) of which evaluation is a
522 fundamental aspect (Pries-Heje et al. 2008). It is important to evaluate how the
523 proposed framework is what it needs to be, and to improve it in order to adapt it to the
524 real needs of the users. Two evaluation perspectives are generally used in Design
525 Science Research to evaluate proposals: *ex ante* evaluation and *ex post* evaluation.
526 While *ex ante* perspective “provides theoretical models to evaluate a proposal without
527 actually implementing the system” (Boton et al. 2013), in *ex post* perspective, the
528 proposals are evaluated after implementation.

529 In the research presented in this paper, an *ex post* perspective has been used to
530 evaluate the proposed framework. It took the form of a case study on a Canadian
531 engineering university, presented below. According to Gerring (2004), a case study is
532 “an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of
533 (similar) units”. This approach is distinguished from other methods by its reliance “on
534 co-variation demonstrated by a single unit and its attempt, at the same time, to
535 illuminate features of a broader set of units” (Gerring 2004). One of the most practical
536 results of case studies is their use in forming descriptive inferences (Gerring 2004). The
537 case study might be descriptive, explanatory or exploratory (Yin 2013). The case study
538 method can use both quantitative and qualitative evidence. This information can come
539 from observations, verbal records, and fieldwork, with multiple data collection methods
540 including ethnographies, participant-observation, etc. (Yin 1981).

541 The objective of the case study presented in the next section is to evaluate the
542 proposed framework by 1) illustrating the main challenges raised with a concrete case,
543 and 2) providing validation elements to iteratively improve, consolidate and validate the

544 proposed framework. The framework presented above is the final version, improved
545 after multiple iterations based on the progressive of the case study.

546 **5. Case Study based on a Canadian Engineering University:** 547 **the ETS-Montreal Experience**

548 In this section, we present the three steps followed for incorporating BIM in the
549 curriculum at ETS-Montréal. The context and the approach steps are introduced and
550 discussed according to the proposed framework.

551 ***5.1 The Context***

552 ETS-Montreal is a Canadian academic institution with an applied engineering-centred
553 mission. To this end, it maintains a close relationship with companies and engineering
554 organisations to ensure that the given education corresponds to the real needs. ETS-
555 Montreal trains engineers in five major business sectors: environment and construction,
556 aerospace and land transportation, energy, health technology, information and
557 communication technologies.

558 The construction engineering department is dedicated to the training of highly qualified
559 personnel according to the needs of the Quebec (and more generally, Canadian) local
560 market. Thus, an important link with the various components of the Canadian
561 construction industry is established and regularly maintained. This link includes
562 defining and conducting research and development projects related to the issues
563 encountered by the industry. Regarding the scientific research, the integration and
564 teaching of information technology is one of the activities of a research lab and an
565 industrial chair.

566 In the following section, the 3-step approach used for BIM teaching at ETS
567 Montreal is discussed according to the proposed framework.

568 ***5.2 The Skills to be Acquired***

569 The skills to be acquired are the main important starting point for BIM curriculum
570 development. In the light of the framework presented above, the level of education, the
571 core competencies and the BIM-specific knowledge related to the ETS-Montreal
572 experience are discussed.

573 ***5.2.1 Level of Education***

574 From the Canadian perspective, there are three levels of BIM education: at college (or
575 CEGEP in Quebec) for the training of technicians or technologists, where BIM tools are
576 learned for 3D design; in a University bachelor degree program where students are
577 trained on working with multidisciplinary design-build collaborative BIM; and in
578 University's master degree programs where students are trained to be change agents,
579 highly qualified staff able to implement BIM technologies, and to manage BIM
580 projects.

581 At ETS-Montreal, the first BIM lessons were not dedicated to any specific level.
582 In order to ensure both the end user and the client participation, practitioners from the
583 construction industry as well as ETS-Montreal's administrative and student sectors were
584 invited to attend the presentations and to provide their feedback. The course consisted
585 of a 'Design lab' experiment, reported by Forgues et al. (2011). It was the entry point of
586 BIM education at ETS-Montreal and was conducted jointly by ETS-Montreal and
587 McGill University through two multidisciplinary courses offered in 2009 and 2011.

588 The second step, consisting of a standalone regular BIM course, was introduced
589 at the master degree level. This intensive course is the first regular one on this topic in

Quebec at the university level. It aims at introducing students to the BIM processes, the use of leading software associated with BIM, and the planning and monitoring of virtual models production. The course focuses on practical modeling work, and thus it is mainly given in an IT laboratory.

Based on the success of the standalone regular BIM module and in response to increasing requests from the industry, a dedicated graduate short program has been developed. This program was designed as an additional training which should enable engineers or professionals to quickly acquire a good knowledge of BIM, thereby training the professionals required for BIM implementation in construction firms and projects.

5.2.2 Core Competencies and BIM-specific Knowledge

As explained above, the introduction of BIM education at ETS-Montreal followed three gradual steps. Due to its objective, the first step (the ‘design lab’ experiment) was not clearly or explicitly linked to the core competencies, as it was not dedicated to any specific level of education. However, a particular emphasis was put on demonstrating the “new skills and technological competencies [...] required to address the upcoming challenges” (Forgues et al. 2011). The main aim was to show how BIM could efficiently support problem-solving and to provide “knowledge on how and when” to use these new skills efficiently (Forgues et al. 2011).

The second step (the standalone regular BIM course at the master degree level) aimed to teach students the main concepts and principles for the implementation of BIM. Upon their completion of this course, students should be able to: understand and manage the different uses of BIM and associated technologies; create BIM models for various construction disciplines (architectural, structural, MEP) and integrate them into a federated model; understand interoperability issues and how to transfer data from

615 BIM software to another one; understand the existing formalisms and tools for the
616 representation of the workflow and the data flow required in a BIM project; define a
617 consistent and efficient strategy to implement BIM; and understand the impact of BIM
618 on the construction industry throughout the life cycle of a building or a facility. The
619 BIM-specific knowledge is thus clearly developed, but not directly related to the core
620 competencies. The main reason for this generalisation is that it is a standalone course
621 which was not really integrated into a complete engineering curriculum.

622 In the third step (the dedicated short program), the BIM knowledge is more
623 anchored in the core competencies. This more integrated program aims to improve
624 knowledge regarding the planning, execution, monitoring and management of BIM
625 projects, relying on advanced techniques in project delivery information flow
626 management. More specifically, this program allows students to understand the impact
627 of information technologies and integrated approaches on industry practices and the
628 concepts of BIM organizational maturity; to define the BIM uses applicable to a project,
629 to define workflows and information flows related to these uses, to develop, implement
630 and manage a BIM management plan and to control the production and the coordination
631 of digital models; to become familiar with the different types of BIM platforms and the
632 related issues of interoperability and different exchange protocols for design and
633 manufacture; as well as to choose the procurement strategies and organization of work
634 and establish metrics to measure performance for the purpose of continuous
635 improvement.

636 The short graduate program consists of 6 modules including a seminar on
637 construction management; a module on information technology in construction, an
638 introduction to Building Information Modeling; a module dedicated to BIM project
639 management and monitoring; a module on construction phase planning using 4D

640 simulation and cost estimating using 5D modeling; and a module on BIM-based energy
641 simulation and analysis.

642 ***5.3 The Teaching Approach***

643 *5.3.1 Teaching Methods and the Technological Environment*

644 In the first step, undergraduate students were organised into five teams with
645 independent workspaces that included electronic devices, a personal computer, a
646 discussion board, a printer, a projector, and an Internet connection. Each student also
647 had their own laptop. Over three two-day intensive sessions, the students' design and
648 modeling skills were complemented with BIM information and dedicated software
649 capsules, including *Design Builder*, *Ecotect Analysis* and *Revit Architecture*.

650 The standalone regular BIM course at the master degree level (step 2) was
651 divided into three sections: introduction of the basics of BIM and architectural design,
652 structural design and construction, and collaboration and specific applications for
653 coordination and analysis. It includes required readings that students must have done
654 before each intensive session, making it possible to focus on the practical aspects of the
655 teaching for an effective Project-Based Learning approach. A number of software
656 packages are learned, including *Autodesk Revit*, *Design Review*, *Tekla Structure*, *Tekla*
657 *BIMsight*, and *Autodesk Navisworks*. Classes are taught in an IT laboratory by BIM-
658 specialized industry professionals. The maximum number of students accepted into the
659 course is limited to 30 students.

660 In the third step, the dedicated short program was designed as a as supplemental training
661 to allow engineers or professionals to quickly acquire a good knowledge of BIM and to
662 provide the efficient professionals necessary for BIM implementation in construction
663 firms and projects. The structure and the methods used in each module are specific to

the peculiarities of the module but are inspired by those used in the standalone course which became a part of the program.

5.3.2 Evaluation Methods

In the first step, students are invited to work in four groups. Each group chooses a common project that the members will work on. They then have to design and develop their proposal during the integrated sessions of design *charrettes*. The teams are invited at the end of each 2-day session to present the result of their iterations and to discuss them in terms of financial, sustainability and technical feasibility criteria. Each presentation is followed by constructive feedback from the other professionals.

In the standalone regular BIM course master degree program, students are invited to complete a session work that integrates the knowledge they have acquired. This work takes the form of a construction project for which students, working in pairs, must gradually develop architectural, structural and coordination models. Quizzes are designed to assess students' individual understanding of the required readings. An individual final exam is also proposed in order to assess the students' overall understanding and to evaluate their perception of BIM uses according to their initial expectations.

Similar evaluation methods are planned to be used in the different modules of the dedicated short program.

5.4 The Implementation Strategy

5.4.1 Approach and Timing

As seen above, the introduction of BIM at ETS-Montreal followed a gradual 3-step approach: a first 'design lab' experiment at the undergraduate level from 2009 to 2011, a standalone regular module at the master degree level to raise awareness from 2014 to

688 2016, and finally a dedicated short program starting in 2017 to achieve comprehensive
689 integration.

690 The 'design lab' experiment was necessary to explore the question and to show
691 how BIM could be useful to support core competencies. It was not a regular course or
692 part of any regular program, limiting the risks or complications for a university. It was
693 very helpful, however, since it was a good opportunity to show BIM to the community
694 (academic and industrial) and to gather feedback about how the different actors position
695 themselves regarding BIM education and to assess their needs and expectations.

696 The standalone regular master degree level module was a first response to these
697 expectations. It was an opportunity for the university to cover the most urgent needs
698 without going too far in terms of investment or conflicts with existing programs and
699 courses. This intermediary milestone was also necessary for identifying the main
700 challenges and issues in the development of a more integrated BIM program. The
701 evaluations from the students were an important aspect and they were carefully
702 analysed. The module benefited from a continuous improvement approach and
703 progressively found its best balance between theory and practice. The success of this
704 standalone course was a good indicator of the increasingly positive reputation acquired
705 by the university in BIM education.

706 After three years, ETS-Montreal was ready to develop a more integrated BIM
707 program. A dedicated short program has then been initiated, a program that benefits
708 from all the achievements of the previous BIM education experiences: the technological
709 environment, the institutional context, the notoriety, the teaching methods and
710 experience, etc. The content of this program was discussed with ETS-Montreal's
711 industrial partners in order to consolidate the partnership with the local industry and to
712 ensure it meets the expectations the industry actors.

713 5.4.2 *The Industrial Partnership*

714 The partnership of ETS-Montreal with the industry in the framework of BIM education
715 was crucial for its success. ETS-Montreal provides the local industry with highly
716 qualified staff, research and development resources, trainees, etc. In response, the
717 support of the industrial partners includes funding opportunities, case studies, job and
718 internship opportunities, etc. Experienced lecturers also come from industry, improving
719 the content and applicability of the lessons delivered. For example, the standalone
720 course was given by two practitioners from industry who also have solid academic
721 backgrounds. The first one is the BIM/VDC (Virtual Design and Construction) director
722 in one of the biggest contractor firms in Canada, holding a Ph.D. degree in architecture
723 and with postdoctoral experience at ETS-Montreal. His profile is especially appropriate
724 for making the bridge between the academic and the industrial worlds. His presence has
725 the double advantage of reassuring the students about the industry's needs and
726 expectations, and the ability to motivate them regarding the importance of research and
727 development for the future of the construction industry. He is complemented with an
728 engineer who is the BIM director in another large engineering group. His position,
729 combined with his previous experience as CEO of a consulting firm specialized in
730 construction and metallic engineering, ensures that he is very well prepared to handle
731 some particular aspects of BIM-related issues.

732 The dedicated short program content has been defined and validated with
733 representatives from the local construction industry in order to ensure it meets the
734 industry's needs and expectations. This approach is not specific to the BIM short
735 program; it is common to all the programs developed at ETS-Montreal. Indeed, due to
736 its nature, ETS-Montreal has had strong links with industry for more than thirty years.
737 One of the main indicators of these links is the high proportion of research funds

738 coming from industrial partnerships, considered as one of the highest among Canadian
739 universities.

740 **6. Lessons learned and discussions**

741 The ETS-Montreal BIM education experience presented above is very useful for
742 illustrating and discussing the different aspects of the proposed framework. It also
743 shows the need for a critical analysis of what is currently being done in engineering
744 universities BIM introduction experiences.

745 The main positive aspect of the ETS-Montreal experience is the gradual
746 approach taken, which shows how a continuous improvement process is necessary in
747 order to adapt the content to the challenges encountered and to incorporate the feedback
748 from both students and industry. This aspect is particularly important in order to ensure
749 a coherent change management and to best integrate the different stakeholders involved
750 in the curriculum development.

751 Another positive aspect at the ETS-Montreal is the interdisciplinary nature of the
752 BIM education content. Indeed, to be fully efficient, a BIM curriculum needs to
753 transversally cover multiple disciplines in order to illustrate the full potential of the BIM
754 approach over a project's lifecycle. The approach taken by ETS-Montreal illustrated the
755 importance of finding a good balance between technical and managerial skills in terms
756 of BIM knowledge. Indeed, while the first BIM curricula focused on software and
757 related competencies, the recent trends are (and should be) oriented towards a more
758 balanced approach in order to better cover the market needs, as identified in recent
759 studies (Abdirad & Dossick 2016; Boton & Forgues 2015).

760 The ETS-Montreal experience also highlighted the importance of a good
761 partnership with the local construction industry. The involvement of industry

762 representatives is critical to ensure a solid commonality with with business practices
763 and an effective bidirectional exchange between training and practice. In the case of the
764 ETS-Montreal, the involvement of the industry is reflected not only in the choice of
765 skilled professionals as teachers, but also in the definition of the training content.
766 Feedback from practitioners is the key to help position the training offer according to
767 the needs of the local market. In addition, integrating students' research subjects and
768 internships closely with Montreal firms brings a clear added value to the training.

769 However, the case study does show a certain number of limitations in the ETS-
770 Montreal experience, the first being the lack of complete integration between BIM-
771 specific knowledge and the core competencies. This lack is well-illustrated by the fact
772 that BIM has not been introduced at the bachelor degree level. Note that the bachelor
773 degree level is where engineering core competencies are expected to be acquired,
774 including both foundational and industry-specific competencies. The underlying issue
775 here has been identified and was explained by Sacks and Barak (2010): "A common
776 debate in many civil engineering degree programs concerns the tension between the
777 need to provide comprehensive education and training and the pressure to limit the
778 number of credits in the bachelor degree".

779 It is also more and more necessary to mention the question of the agility
780 necessary in today's curriculum in relation to a changing industrial environment. The
781 industry is changing rapidly; knowledge is no longer generated by academic research
782 but by advances in the industry. Thus, the tight relationship with industry depicted in
783 Figure 5 deserves special attention, as the links between teaching and research keep the
784 programs' content up to date.

785 Another important limitation in ETS-Montreal's case lies in the lack of
786 involvement of the university's administration and management. BIM is a disruptive

787 technology; it difficult for many university staff to be aware of what competencies the
788 industry will be demanding in the future and how to integrate them with today's needs.
789 A major difficulty is the rigidity and fragmentation of the research, academic and
790 pedagogical structures, which tends to create a strong resistance to change. Obtaining
791 support from management and administration is thus key to overcoming this resistance
792 to change. However, with the lack of market pressure, these administrators are barely or
793 not at all aware of the issues and the importance of BIM, and tend to oppose the
794 integration of BIM instead of encouraging it. We must add that in Canada, engineering
795 curricula are subject to approval by accreditation by third parties who are usually
796 disconnected from innovative business practices. The use of the proposed framework
797 can be a good opportunity to make the connection. For example, it can help in the
798 definition of how the progressive introduction of new technologies and practices like
799 BIM can improve the existing graduate attributes' assessment system (required by
800 CEAB) and to implement a continuous improvement mechanism.

801

802 **7. Conclusion**

803 The engineering universities are facing major dilemmas for a successful BIM
804 introduction in their curricula. Many frameworks have been proposed for different
805 aspects of BIM implementation in education. However, no comprehensive framework
806 has been presented to support BIM introduction in engineering universities, nor to assist
807 researchers in the comparison of BIM programs. This paper proposed a comprehensive
808 framework, encompassing the skills to acquire, the teaching approach, the evaluation
809 methods, the technological environment, the industrial partnerships, the implementation
810 approach and the timing.

811 The ETS-Montreal case study is a unique opportunity to illustrate the use of the
812 proposed framework. Future work will focus on how such a framework can be used and
813 evaluated in other academic contexts. Similar programs around the world will be
814 studied in the light of the framework in order to consolidate it as well as to identify and
815 formalize the common best practices. Further evaluations and validations will also be
816 conducted in order to the generalizability of this work to other emerging technologies
817 and practices. The new dedicated short program at ETS-Montreal will be closely
818 monitored to assess how it works and how it is perceived by the students, as well as by
819 local industry. Future work will also study in more details the link between disciplines
820 and roles in order to better address the varied requirements of different professionals
821 and students. Due to the high level of complexity in these requirements, we have made
822 the choice, in this paper, of a good level of abstraction in order to provide a consistent
823 and understandable proposal.

824 **8. References**

- 825 Abdirad, H., & Dossick, C. S. (2016). BIM curriculum design in architecture,
826 engineering, and construction education: a systematic review. *ITcon Vol. 21*, Pg. 250-
827 271, <http://www.itcon.org/2016/17>, 21(17), 250–271.
- 828 Attar, G. A., & Sweis, R. J. (2010). The relationship between information technology
829 adoption and job satisfaction in contracting companies in Jordan. *Journal of*
830 *Information Technology in Construction ITCon*, 15(January), 44–63.
- 831 Barison, M. B., & Santos, E. T. (2010a). An overview of BIM specialists Roles and
832 responsibilities of BIM Specialists. In W. Tizani (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International*
833 *Conference on Computing in Civil Engineering*.
- 834 Barison, M. B., & Santos, E. T. (2010b). Review and analysis of current strategies for
835 planning a BIM curriculum. In *Proceedings of the CIB W78 2010: 27th International*
836 *Conference* (pp. 16–18).

- 837 Becerik-Gerber, B., Gerber, D. J., & Ku, K. (2011). The pace of technological
838 innovation in architecture, engineering, and construction education: Integrating recent
839 trends into the curricula. *Electronic Journal of Information Technology in Construction*,
840 16, 411–432.
- 841 Bloom, B. S., et al. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of*
842 *student learning*. (McGraw-Hil). New York.
- 843 Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, E., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Guzdial, M., & al. (1991).
844 Motivating Project-Based Learning: Sustaining the Doing, Supporting the Learning.
845 *Educational Psychologist*. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2603&4_8
- 846 Boton, C., & Forgues, D. (2015). BIM projects. Is it the end for the Construction Project
847 Manager? In *Proceedings of Asia-Pacific Researchers in Organisation Studies -*
848 *APROS/EGOS Conference*. Sydney, Australia.
- 849 Boton, C. , Kubicki, S. & Halin, G. (2013). Designing Adapted Visualization for
850 Collaborative 4D Applications, *Automation in Construction*, 36 (1), 52–67.
- 851 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board. (2017). Accreditation Criteria and
852 Procedures. CEAB, Ottawa, Ontario.
- 853 Char, S. V, & Collier, C. A. (2015). Chalk and Talk Versus Classroom Flipping :
854 Results of a Case Study. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5(1), 24–28.
855 <http://doi.org/10.9790/7388-05112428>
- 856 Cheng, R. (2006). Suggestions for an integrative education. *American Institute of*
857 *Architects Report on Integrated Practice*.
- 858 De Graaff, E.. (2013). The Transformation Process from a Traditional Curriculum to
859 Problem-Based and Project-Based Learning. *The 41th Conference of the International-*
860 *Group for the European Society for Engineering Education*, (September), 16–20.
- 861 Eastman, C., Teicholz, P., Sacks, R., & Liston, K. (2011). *BIM Handbook: A Guide to*
862 *Building Information Modeling for Owners, Managers, Designers, Engineers and*
863 *Contractors*.
- 864 Egan, J. (1998). *Rethinking Construction. The Report of the Construction Task Force*.
865 Construction Task Force.
- 866 Employment and Training Administration. (2015). *Engineering Competency Model*.

- 867 Faust, R. (2016). BIM Curriculum Development. In R. R. Issa (Ed.), *Proceedings of the*
868 *10th BIM Academic Symposium* (pp. 122–129). Orlando, Florida (USA).
- 869 Forgues, D., Staub-French, S., & Farah, L. M. (2011). Teaching Building Design and
870 Construction Engineering. Are we ready for the paradigm shift? In *Proceedings of the*
871 *Canadian Engineering Education Association*.
- 872 Fruchter, R. (1999). A/E/C Teamwork: A Collaborative Design and Learning Space.
873 *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 10(2), 95–102.
- 874 Gerring, J. (2004). What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *The American*
875 *Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341–354.
- 876 Goedert, J., Cho, Y., Subramaniam, M., Guo, H., & Xiao, L. (2011). A framework for
877 Virtual Interactive Construction Education (VICE). *Automation in Construction*, 20(1),
878 76–87. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2010.07.002>
- 879 Haas, C. T., Borcharding, J. D., Allmon, E., & Goodrum, P. M. (1999). *US construction*
880 *labor productivity trends, 1970-1998. Journal of Construction Engineering and*
881 *Management*. Austin, Texas.
- 882 Heitmann, G. (1996). Project-oriented study and project-organized curricula: A brief
883 review of intentions and solutions. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 21(2),
884 121–131. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03043799608923395>
- 885 Hevner, A., March, S., Park, J., Ram, S. (2004) Design science in information systems
886 research, *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), 75–105.
- 887 Hore, A. V., Scott, L., West, R., & Tibaut, A. (2016). Benefits of Inter-institutional
888 Collaboration in the Delivery of BIM Education in Ireland: Reflections of an Irish
889 Masters Program. In *Proceedings of the 10th BIM Academic Symposium* (pp. 152–165).
890 Orlando, Florida (USA).
- 891 Horne, M. (2006). The role of higher education in nD modelling implementation.
892 *Constructing the Future: nD Modelling*, 309–325.
- 893 Issa, R. R. (2016). *Proceedings of the 10th BIM Academic Symposium*. Orlando, Florida
894 (USA).
- 895 Jupp, J. R., & Nepal, M. (2014). BIM and PLM : Comparing and Learning from
896 Changes to Professional Practice Across Sectors. In S. Fukuda, A. Bernard, B.

- 897 Gurumoorthy, & A. Bouras (Eds.), *PLM 2014, IFIP AICT 442* (pp. 41–50).
- 898 Kilroy, D. A. (2003). Problem based learning. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 21, 411–
899 413. <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7384.328>
- 900 Kim, J. (2012). Use of BIM for effective visualization teaching approach in construction
901 education. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*,
902 138(3), 214–223. [http://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)EI.1943-5541.0000102](http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EI.1943-5541.0000102).
- 903 Kocaturk, T., & Kiviniemi, A. (2013). Challenges of Integrating BIM in Architectural
904 Education. *Computation and Performance – Proceedings of the 31st eCAADe*
905 *Conference (Vol. 2)*, 2, 465–474.
- 906 Kreider, R. G., & Messner, J. I. (2013). The Uses of BIM: Classifying and Selecting
907 BIM Uses, (September), 1–22.
- 908 Kubicki, S., & Botton, C. (2011). 4D-based Teaching of High-rise Structural Principles.
909 In *Proceedings of the CIB W78-W102 2011 International Conference*. Sophia Antipolis.
- 910 Lage, M. J., Platt, G. J., & Treglia, M. (2000). Inverting the Classroom: A Gateway to
911 Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment. *The Journal of Economic Education*,
912 31(1), 30–43. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00220480009596759>
- 913 Liu, R., & Berumen, L. (2016). Digital Project Coordination Experience in
914 Undergraduate Construction Education. In R. R. Issa (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th*
915 *BIM Academic Symposium* (pp. 61–67). Orlando, Florida (USA).
- 916 Lowell Bishop, J., & Verleger, M. (2013). The Flipped Classroom : A Survey of the
917 Research. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Society for*
918 *Engineering Education* (pp. 1–18). <http://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2013.6684807>
- 919 Macdonald, J. a. (2011). A Framework for Collaborative BIM Education Across the
920 Aec Disciplines. *37th Annual Conference of the Australasian Universities Building*
921 *Educators Association (AUBEA)*, 223–230.
- 922 March, S.T. & Smith, G.F. (1995). Design and natural science research on information
923 technology, *Decision Support Systems*, 15(4), 251–266.
- 924 Messner, J. (n.d.). *The Story of BIM Adoption at Penn State*.
925 <https://portal.nibs.org/files/wl/?id=v3jOimby06e7xi1hEQoQVBuGAhEM4VTe>
926 (accessed June 29, 2018).

- 927 Mills, J. E., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Engineering education - Is Problem-Based or
928 Project-Based Learning the Answer? *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 3,
929 ISSN 1324-5821. <http://doi.org/10.1108/13552540210420989>
- 930 Nikas, A., Poulymenakou, A., & Kriaris, P. (2007). Investigating antecedents and
931 drivers affecting the adoption of collaboration technologies in the construction industry.
932 *Automation in Construction*, 16(5), 632–641.
933 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2006.10.003>
- 934 Pekuri, A., Haapasalo, H., & Herva, M. (2011). Productivity and performance
935 management - managerial practices in the construction industry. *International Journal*
936 *of Performance Measurement*.
- 937 Perrenet, J. C., Bouhuijs, P. a. J., & Smits, J. G. M. M. (2000). The Suitability of
938 Problem-based Learning for Engineering Education: Theory and practice. *Teaching in*
939 *Higher Education*, 5(3), 345–358. <http://doi.org/10.1080/713699144>
- 940 Pries-Heje, J., Baskerville, R., Venable, J. (2008). Strategies for design science research
941 evaluation, *ECIS 2008 Proceedings*, 1–12.
- 942 Sacks, R., & Barak, R. (2010). Teaching Building Information Modeling as an Integral
943 Part of Freshman Year Civil Engineering Education. *Journal of Professional Issues in*
944 *Engineering Education and Practice*, 136(1), 30–38.
945 [http://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)EI.1943-5541.0000003](http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EI.1943-5541.0000003)
- 946 Sacks, R., & Pikas, E. (2013). Building Information Modeling Education for
947 Construction Engineering and Management. I: Industry Requirements, State of the Art,
948 and Gap Analysis. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 139(11),
949 4013016. [http://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000759](http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000759).
- 950 Shelbourn, M. ., Macdonald, J., & Mills, J. (2016). Developing an International
951 Framework for BIM Education in the HE Sector. In *Proceedings of the 10th BIM*
952 *Academic Symposium* (pp. 43–51). Orlando, Florida (USA).
- 953 Succar, B. (2009). Building information modelling framework: A research and delivery
954 foundation for industry stakeholders. *Automation in Construction*, 18(3), 357–375.
955 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2008.10.003>
- 956 Succar, B., & Sher, W. (2013). A Competency Knowledge-base for BIM Learning.
957 *Australasian Universities Building Education (AUBEA2013)*, (2013), 10.

958 <http://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.2439.6481>

959 Treagust, D. F. (1995). Diagnostic assessment of students' science knowledge. *Learning*
960 *Science in the Schools: Research Reforming Practice*, 1, 327–436.

961 Yin, R. K. (1981). The Case Study Crisis : Some Answers *. *Administrative Science*
962 *Quarterly*, 26(March), 58–65.

963 Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: design and methods*. SAGE Publications.

964

965

Draft

966 **List of abbreviations**

967	ABET:	Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
968	AC:	Academic Competencies
969	AEC:	Architecture, Engineering and Construction
970	AIA:	American Society of Architects
971	BIM :	Building Information Modeling
972	BTK:	BIM Teaching Knowledge
973	CAD:	Computer-Aided Design
974	ETS:	École de Technologie Supérieure
975	IMAC:	Illustration, Manipulation, Application, Collaboration stages
976	ISTC:	Industry-Sector Technical Competencies
977	IWTC:	Industry-Wide Technical Competencies
978	PBL:	Project-Based Learning
979	PEC:	Personal Effectiveness Competencies
980	Ph.D.:	Philosophiæ Doctor
981	R&D:	Research and Development
982	VDC:	Virtual Design and Construction
983	WPC:	Workplace Competencies