ARC Framework Implementation Guide

Practical Guide for Integrating Industrial Robotics and Adaptive Control Systems in Engineering Education

Document Version:	1.0.0
Release Date:	January 13, 2026
Framework Version:	ARC v1.0
Author:	Claudio Urrea
ORCID:	0000-0001-7197-8928
Institution:	University of Santiago of Chile
License:	CC BY 4.0

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to the ARC Framework

The ARC (Automation-Robotics-Control) Framework provides evidence-based guidance for integrating industrial-grade robotics and adaptive control systems into engineering education. Based on systematic review of 52 empirical studies (2019-2025) and validated through experimental research with industrial manipulators, the framework addresses the critical skills gap between academic preparation and Industry 4.0/5.0 workforce demands.

1.1 Framework Components

The ARC Framework integrates five interconnected dimensions to guide systematic technology transfer from industrial automation to educational contexts:

1. **Technology Complexity Taxonomy:** Five-level classification from educational kits (Level 1-2) through advanced educational platforms (Level 3) and didactic industrial systems (Level 4) to industrial-grade manipulators (Level 5).

2. **Competency Progression Model:** Structured pathway from Novice through Advanced Beginner, Competent, and Proficient levels to Expert, aligned with Dreyfus model of skill acquisition.

3. **Pedagogical Strategies Matrix:** Evidence-based instructional approaches matched to technology levels and competency stages, emphasizing constructivist and experiential learning.

4. **Assessment Framework:** Competency-based evaluation rubrics measuring technical knowledge, programming skills, system integration, problem-solving, safety awareness, and documentation.

5. **Implementation Pathways:** Three models (full infrastructure, hybrid access, fully remote) accommodating diverse institutional contexts and resource constraints.

2. Technology Selection Process

Selecting appropriate technology represents the most critical decision in implementing the ARC Framework. This selection should be driven by evidence-based analysis of your specific context, not by vendor marketing or availability alone.

2.1 Decision Criteria

Criterion	Weight	Considerations
Learning Objectives	30%	Alignment with curriculum goals, competency targets, accreditation requirements
Budget Constraints	25%	Total cost of ownership: equipment, maintenance, training, space
Student Readiness	20%	Prior knowledge, technical background, expected competency level
Infrastructure	15%	Lab space, safety systems, technical support, network connectivity
Transferability	10%	Relevance to industry, job market demands, skill portability

2.2 Technology Levels Summary

Level	Cost/Student	Effect Size	Optimal For
Level 1-2 Educational Kits	$300-800	d=0.59-0.64	K-12, intro courses
Level 3 Advanced Educational	$2,000-5,000	d=0.68	Undergrad engineering
Level 4 Didactic Industrial	$8,000-15,000	d=0.73	Advanced undergrad
Level 5 Industrial-Grade	$35,000-150,000	d=0.94	Professional training
Level 5 Remote Remote Laboratory	$45/student	d=0.89	ALL LEVELS (optimal ROI)

Key Finding: Remote laboratories achieve 95% of industrial-grade effectiveness at 4% of the cost ($45/student vs $280/student), representing optimal return on investment.

3. Curriculum Design and Integration

Effective integration requires progressive competency development aligned with technology complexity levels.

4. Infrastructure and Safety Requirements

Proper infrastructure ensures safe, effective learning environments compliant with ISO 10218 and ISO/TS 15066.

5. Pedagogical Strategies

Challenge-Based Learning (d=0.89) and Project-Based Learning (d=0.79) produce strongest outcomes.

6. Assessment and Evaluation

Competency-based assessment with validated rubrics across six domains provides clear skill progression criteria.

7. Implementation Timeline

Typical implementation requires 18-24 months across planning, selection, development, training, pilot, and full deployment.

8. Cost-Benefit Analysis

Comprehensive 5-year TCO analysis quantifies tangible and intangible benefits against investment costs.

9. Common Challenges and Solutions

Address high costs through partnerships, expertise gaps via training, safety through protocols, curriculum via modularity.

10. Case Studies

Successful implementations: Research university (Level 5 physical), Regional university (Level 5 remote), Community college (hybrid).

11. Resources and Support

FigShare repository, GitHub code, Excel decision tools, assessment rubrics, and direct consultation available.

12. Appendices

Glossary of terms, recommended reading list, and supplementary resources included.

Implementation Checklist

- ■ Conduct needs assessment with stakeholders (faculty, students, industry partners)
- ■ Define learning objectives and competency targets aligned with accreditation
- ■ Complete budget analysis and secure funding from multiple sources
- ■ Select technology level using decision tool and evidence-based criteria
- ■ Design or renovate laboratory space with adequate safety systems
- ■ Install safety systems and obtain necessary certifications (ISO compliance)
- ■ Arrange comprehensive faculty professional development programs
- ■ Develop curriculum modules and competency-based assessment rubrics
- ■ Pilot implementation with small student group and collect feedback
- ■ Analyze evaluation data and refine pedagogical approach iteratively
- ■ Scale to full implementation across cohorts and programs
- ■ Establish continuous improvement processes and industry partnerships

Contact and Support

Framework Developer: Claudio Urrea, PhD
Institution: Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Santiago of Chile
Email: claudio.urrea@usach.cl
ORCID: 0000-0001-7197-8928

FigShare Repository: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.31053583
GitHub Repository: https://github.com/ClaudioUrrea/ARC-Framework

How to Cite This Guide

Urrea, C. (2026). *ARC Framework Implementation Guide: Practical Guide for Integrating Industrial Robotics and Adaptive Control Systems in Engineering Education* (Version 1.0.0). University of Santiago of Chile. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.31053583