

Integrating Human-Centric Approaches into Undergraduate Software Engineering Education: A Scoping Review and Curriculum Analysis in the Australian Context

Sophie McKenzie*

School of Information Technology
Deakin University, Geelong 3216
sophie.mckenzie@deakin.edu.au

Xiao Lui

School of Information Technology
Deakin University, Geelong 3216
xiao.lui@deakin.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Human-Centric Software Engineering (HCSE) refers to the software engineering (SE) processes that put human needs and requirements as core practice throughout the software development life cycle. A large majority of software projects fail to cater to human needs and consequently run into budget, delivery, and usability issues. To support human-centric software engineering practices, it is important for universities to train their students on how to consider human needs. But what topics from HCSE should be provided in the undergraduate curriculum? This is still an open question. Curriculum guidelines for software engineering are available, however do not represent update to date considerations for how human-factors are included. In addition, curriculum approaches are not explored. To address this issue, this paper presents a scoping review to identify the topics and curriculum approaches suitable for teaching HCSE to undergraduate software engineering students. The scoping review was conducted according to the protocol by PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews). Through PRISMA-ScR, a total of 36 conference or journal papers were identified as viable for analysis, with 5 common themes found that describe topics and curriculum approaches relevant for teaching software engineering. Using the outcomes of the scoping review, this paper also analyses the Australian Software Engineering curriculum to understand the extent at which human centred software engineering topics are scaffolded into course structures. This paper concludes by suggesting topic scaffolding for the undergraduate curriculum that aligns with the software engineering process. Overall, by providing a focus on

HCSE topics and curriculum approaches, the education and awareness of HCSE among current and future software engineers can increase, leading to long-term impact on the success of software projects for all stakeholders.

KEYWORDS

Software Engineering, Curriculum, Higher Education, Teaching

1 INTRODUCTION

Software solutions are developed to solve issues for a set of users and meet their requirements [39]. The users of the software (mostly humans) should be the centre of attention when developing software solutions; however, this is still not often the case despite progress in software engineering (SE) and development methodologies [19, 20]. A large majority of software projects fail to cater to human needs and consequently run into budget, delivery, and usability issues. A recent example of software solutions that failed to deliver on human needs is the COVID-19 contact tracing apps, which were developed for all citizens but did not consider human aspects [4, 5, 22]. For example, the failure of Australia's COVIDSafe app has caused the waste of more than \$ 21 million.

Grundy et al. [21] have explored human-centric software engineering (HCSE) and list the human aspects that should be considered, depending on the application domain and the software solution being developed. HCSE refers to the SE processes that place human-centric requirements as first-class citizens and focus on including diverse users and their requirements. In the work reported in [20], Grundy et al. have presented a taxonomy of human aspects and classify them into following major categories:

- (1) Personal demographic characteristics including age, gender, ethnicity, personality, emotions, engagement, physical

- or mental challenges, cognitive style (problem-solving approaches of different humans), and preferences.
- (2) Skill or expertise-based (including environment-influenced) characteristics including spoken language, socio-economic status, language proficiency, education, technology comfort, location, religious beliefs, human values, and skill level.
 - (3) Group-based characteristics including culture, geographic location, team climate, family environment (marital status / caring responsibilities), work status, collaboration and communication style, and organisational or societal values.

Pursuing HCSE as a practice is important but challenging. The education and awareness of HCSE among current and future software engineers can lead to a long-term impact [21, 24]. Although the human aspects of SE should be a significant part of any undergraduate or postgraduate SE program according to the guidelines of the software engineering curriculum [24, 26], HCSE still remains at the periphery of curriculum approaches. What aspects of HCSE should be included in the undergraduate curriculum? To address this, we have employed a two-pronged methodology. First, a scoping review of existing peer-reviewed literature was conducted to identify the existing teaching and learning topics and approaches for human-centric software engineering in higher education. The scoping review was conducted according to the PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews). Next, we performed an analysis of current undergraduate Software Engineering curricula across Australian universities. The aim of this curriculum analysis has been to assess the extent to which the topics and methods identified in our scoping review are actually incorporated into existing programs. By juxtaposing these two sets of data, we seek to provide a nuanced understanding of the current state and potential future directions for HCSE education in Australia.

Our research is guided by the following research questions (RQs):

- RQ1 – What are the central human-centric topics that should be taught to undergraduate students when studying software engineering?
- RQ2 - What curriculum approaches are suitable to teach undergraduate human-centric software engineering?
- RQ3- To what extent are the identified human-centric topics and curriculum approaches integrated into current Australian undergraduate Software Engineering programs?

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the methodology for the scoping review and the selection criteria for the software engineering courses in Australian Universities. Section 3 presents the review results. Section 4 provides further discussions and the threats to validity. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper and points to some future research directions.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Scoping Review

As mentioned, we utilised a scoping review approach to address the first two research questions RQ1 and RQ2 looking at topics and approaches in teaching human-centered software engineering in higher education. Our review was conducted according to the PRISMA-ScR [44]. We first utilised PCC (Population, Concept

and Context) to help determine our search criteria as shown in Table 1, before moving into identification, screening, and selection of relevant papers.

PCC Element	Key words	Alternative key words
Population	Higher Education	postgraduate, undergraduate, curriculum and research project
Concept	Human Aspects	human centred, human values, ethics and inclusion
Context	Software Engineering	

Table 1: PCC Search Criteria

When constructing our scoping review, it was important to have preliminary searches in each online database relevant to the project topic. In relation to the PCC framework, alternative key words were considered, as elements such as synonyms, different terminology, word plurals, different word forms and common acronyms discovered in previous iterations of the research process which can be utilised further. This is a critical step of the scoping review search process, as the search is required to be comprehensive and narrow using the connectors and/or with the alternative words, as some records have the tendency of referring to the same idea in a different way within the literature. Finally, the initiation search was completed using the following search string:

"Software Engineering" AND ("higher education" or "undergraduate" or "postgraduate" or "curriculum" or "research project") AND ("human aspects" or "human values" or "ethics" or "inclusion").

2.1.1 Article Identification. A search of IEEE, ACM, Springer, Emerald database and the published proceedings for the International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE) was conducted. To help the search, we defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. We included any peer reviewed journal articles, papers in conference proceedings or professional body reports (e.g., SWEBOK), written in English and published between 2000 and 2022. We excluded any papers not in English or any extended abstracts or non-refereed journal articles and conference papers, magazine articles and books. This search led to 269 papers. The identification, screening, and selection of these papers are shown in Figure 1.

2.2 Data Extraction and Analysis

Through searching the listed databases, 296 files were found to be viable for selection based on a review of their title, abstract and keywords. To be selected for inclusion in the scoping review the article needed to focus on software engineering in higher education and specifically mention the topic of human-factors or human-centric in the abstract. Using this screening process, 36 articles appeared viable for analysis. Taking forward the 36 articles identified during screening, data extraction was undertaken. Each article was reviewed, with detail of each article captured in a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet contained the following information from each article:

- Full Article title
- Year of publication
- Database source
- Publisher
- The topic or concept that is central to the article, i.e. curriculum structure




Figure 1: PRISMA scoping review protocol

- Research aim and/ or research question(s) of the article
- Summary of finding, drawn from the conclusion

Data extraction was completed largely by one researcher collecting the data items on an excel spreadsheet. However, to inform the data extraction process, another researcher also reviewed a subset (5) articles to extract relevant information. This extraction process was compared for consistency to inform resultant information extracted, particularly in regard to the topic or concept of each article and the associated findings. A summary of the 36 articles identified in the scoping review, detailing the information captured from each paper that was taken forward in analysis, can be found in the supplementary materials. Together, the categories on paper topic and findings as collated when analysing each of the 36 articles informed overall ‘themes’ in analysis. Initial codes, using Grundy et al., were developed to assist with analysis. These a priori codes were included as a starting point of inductive analysis [42], which saw further codes on human-centered topics and approaches added as each article was reviewed. Once all articles were reviewed codes were grouped into broader categories and then themes that focus on topics and approaches to teaching human-centered software engineering. Through three phases, the article topics and findings were grouped and re-grouped to merge scoping review outcomes to develop a structure of experience. Two researchers informed this process, regularly discussing theme outcomes to validate both approach and outcomes. Generally, themes were derived that focus on topics (concepts of human-centric software engineering) and approaches (teaching and learning methods and curriculum structure. Four overall themes were identified from the articles sampled in the scoping review that relate to topics. Table 2 provide a summary of how the themes identified discuss the SE topic, along with teaching and learning methods that can be used to explore the topic. Following these, a further three themes were derived in relation to SE approaches, discussing in depth, how the topics and method can be applied in a broader view of human-centric software engineering.

2.3 Review of Current Australian Software Engineering Curriculum

The selection criteria for the university courses to be included in this review were threefold:

- (1) Courses must be accredited or provisionally accredited by Engineers Australia for the year 2023
- (2) Courses must offer a minimum four-year undergraduate program inclusive of honours, and
- (3) The course title must explicitly contain the phrase ‘Software Engineering.’

Based on these criteria, we identified a total of 14 courses currently being offered across Australia.

For each selected institution, the corresponding course web page was archived in PDF format. Whenever feasible, this archival process included the complete list of subjects or units offered within each course. In instances where this information was not readily available, the course learning outcomes and detailed course descriptions were captured instead. We employed Nvivo software for conducting a thematic analysis on the course content and pedagogical approaches. During the coding phase, the list of subjects or units served as the primary data source, while course learning outcomes and detailed course descriptions were considered secondary data sources. Both sets of data were coded to assess the inclusion of topics identified in our initial scoping review.

The thematic analysis was guided by both a priori and inductive coding strategies. Topics and pedagogical approaches identified in the scoping review served as a priori themes. Concurrently, inductive analysis was used to allow for emergent themes. This dual approach facilitated the categorization of relevant topics presented within the courses, highlighting commonalities in the software engineering curricula. In addition, teaching approaches were analyzed using both a priori themes from the scoping review and emerging inductive themes.

3 RESULTS

As a result of our scoping review, we analyzed 36 academic articles and identified five salient themes that merit integration into software engineering curricula to adequately address human-centric dimensions. These themes are elaborated upon below. In the following, we outline our observations to address the research questions in Section 1. Please refer to the supplementary materials for a summary of the 36 articles.

3.1 RQ1: Central human-centric topics that should be taught to undergraduate students when studying software engineering

3.1.1 *The ‘soft’ topics and soft skills in software engineering education.* Matturo et al. [35] conducted a systematic mapping of important human-centric skills that should be part of the SE curriculum, such as ethics, listening, and interpersonal skills. Garcia et al. [17] conducted a structured literature review of games used to teach SE topics and found that ethics as a soft skill, along with problem-solving and communication skills as areas of focus. Ardis et al. [3] investigated the inclusion of observing, reviewing, presenting, writing, planning, cooperating, reflecting, and judging skills as

a part of the SE curriculum. Several articles mention the need for SE students to exhibit skills of reflection and abstraction. Hazzan and Tomayko have published several articles on SE teaching and learning, specifically on teaching human aspects of SE [23, 26, 27]. In articles [26, 27] Hazzan and Tomayko put a focus on human aspects of software engineering based on the concepts of reflection and abstraction. Reflection refers to reflective thinking in students, i.e., the ability of students to rethink and examine their work. Abstraction refers to the ability of software engineers to work at different abstraction levels, e.g., in requirements engineering and design stages, the software engineers need to focus on a very high-level view of the entire software system, whereas for implementation and testing, they need to delve deeper and think about each class (local perspective).

3.1.2 Teaching ethics in the software engineering curriculum. Various studies argued that SE course should teach ethics [18, 38, 43]. Topics in ethics that should be taught include: Confidentiality; Conflict of Interest; Encryption and privacy; Fairness and discrimination; Intellectual Property; Liability and risks in health and safety critical environments; Quality and testing; Unauthorized access and computer security; and Whistleblowing [43]. Of these topics, those rated more important for teaching SE students included Quality and testing (the accurate assessment of expected and observed behaviour of software systems) and Liability and risks in critical health and safety environments (including legal obligations) [43]. When it comes to how ethics should be taught in SE curricula, methods reported include: discussion in personal experience in classrooms; discussing code of ethics from bodies such as IEEE and ACM; discussing case studies; assigning readings; and assigning research papers [38, 43]. It is recommended by the authors that ethics is taught throughout the SE curriculum, embedded within numerous subject offerings [18, 38, 43].

3.1.3 HCI and UI factors. There is a focus in the literature on teaching Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) in the SE curricula [12, 45]. Veer and Vliet [45] proposed a structure to introduce HCI concepts in the SE curriculum, making a particular focus on the user interface (UI) design as a key component of system design. HCI and UI topics that should be covered in the curriculum include: Applied cognitive psychology: The students should be aware of human behaviour, characteristics, and needs; Ethnography and ethnomethodology: The students should learn about interaction analysis, i.e., different patterns of human-machine interaction in different situations; SE architecture for UI design: Patterns such as model-view-control; Graphical design: The students should learn the art of action and results and have the requisite knowledge of designing dialogue scenarios; Interaction design: The students should be aware of the emotional cues to users' cultural values and should be able to use this knowledge for interaction design for intended user behaviour [23].

3.1.4 Understanding people and culture. When teaching SE, educators should also take into account the personality traits of students along with the personality traits and human factors related to the end users. For example, Ahmed et al. [2] present a unique view on the SE teaching and learning aspects based on students' personality traits. Foster et al. [16] reported on the experience of students

working in multi-cultural teams and how this can be beneficial for students to consider a variety of perspectives on how to design for end user.

3.1.5 A focus on requirements engineering. The scoping review identified that in the early requirements engineering phase, a focus on human aspects is required. Lethbridge [31, 32] identified that requirements engineering and ethics are the main topics that SE practitioners utilise in their profession, even though most did not receive formal training in these topics prior. In relation to teaching methods, Kamthan et al. [29] explored social web environments as a teaching method for promoting collaborative software engineering education and for requirements engineering. Portela et al. [14] reported that a student focus in teaching and learning could improve graduate outcomes and enable greater engagement with the user requirements engineering process.

3.2 RQ2: Curriculum approaches suitable to teach undergraduate human-centric software engineering courses

In addition to identifying topics to be taught in the SE curriculum, the scoping review also identified approaches or ways to teach SE. Table 2 lists the approaches as identified, presented alongside the topics. It was identified that topics are often presented alongside certain approaches. One approach that appeared throughout the literature as a way to teach software engineering was service learning. Service learning is defined as the "course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of curricular content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility" [33]. Service learning has been used in SE teaching in several instances for teaching students real-world experience, team and social skills, problem-based learning [6] and improving their civic responsibility [10, 11, 13, 15, 33, 34, 41]. Overall, working on community needs projects is closely aligned with approaches in human-centric software engineering, given the project requirements and the pedagogical setup. For instance, Chao and Brown [9] [36] used projects from local non-profit organisations as student projects. They found that such projects helped improve students' understanding of client requirements and learning from their experience. Chao and Randles [10] also implemented an agile software factory to manage such service-learning projects' administrative tasks to enable the project deliverables and documentation continuity and maintenance.

3.3 RQ3: Human-centric topics and curriculum approaches in current Australian undergraduate Software Engineering programs

Using the results of the scoping review analysis, a review of current Australian Software Engineering Curriculum was conducted (as described in section 2.3). Table 3 describes the topics found in SE courses in Australia. A simple count demonstrates the number of curricula in which the topic was found is shown.

Topic	Associated teaching method
Soft skills in SE should include: listening, interpersonal skills, problem-solving, communication, reflection and abstraction	Observing, writing and judging, service learning
SE should discuss ethics: quality and testing (the accurate assessment of expected and observed behaviour of software systems) and Liability and risks in critical health and safety environments (including legal obligations).	Discussion of personal experience in classrooms; discussing code of ethics from bodies such as IEEE and ACM; discussing case studies; assigning readings; and assigning research papers.
HCI and UI Factors such as: applied cognitive psychology, ethnography and ethnomethodology, SE architecture for UI design, graphical design, interaction design.	Interweaving UI design in the main software development process, service learning
Understanding people and culture: personality types, personality traits and cultural understanding	Personality tests, working in multi-disciplinary teams, case studies, service learning.
A strong focus on requirements engineering in SE: understanding user requirements and perspective from a broad cultural perspective, and in multiple languages	Gathering requirements in multiple languages, social web collaborative environments, student focused activities that promote multidisciplinary groups, service learning

Table 2: Summary of topic and associated teaching method found in scoping review

Topic	Number of Institutions
Programming: This includes broad programming concepts and languages such as: object-oriented programming, systems programming, operating systems, machine learning, artificial intelligence, computer graphics, computer architecture, natural language processing, full-stack development, web development, mobile application development, image processing, parallel computing, blockchain and deep learning.	14
Mathematics: This includes many mathematics topics such as: discrete mathematics, statistics, modelling and analysis, data science, calculus and linear algebra.	14
Data and Algorithms: This theme included topics such as: algorithms, data structures, database, and data mining.	12
Soft-transferable skills: This includes many soft skills such as: problem-solving, communication, reflection and abstraction, innovation and creativity, entrepreneurial mindset, leadership, professional practice, professional standards, teamwork, and collaboration.	11
Computer Systems and Hardware: This theme included topics such as: embedded design, computer system design, electronics, and digital systems.	11
Software Development Process: This includes topics such as: software process improvement, complex systems, systems analysis and modelling, and software quality and testing.	10
Networking: This includes topics such as: Computer networks, distributed systems and network programming.	10
Cybersecurity: This includes topics such as: Cybersecurity fundamentals, software security, IT forensics and cloud computing.	10
Ethics: This includes broad topics such as 'engineering in society' along with legal and political implications in software engineering.	8
Broad human factors: This includes broad topics such as: Human Factors for Decision Making, Sustainable Design, Humanitarian Design, General Design, and Innovation.	7
Requirements Engineering: This includes topics such as: software process improvement, pre-requirements definition, and user requirements.	7
People and Culture: This includes the topic of indigenous context.	1

Table 3: Topics included in Software Engineering Curriculum in Australia

In the curriculum review, discipline topics such as programming, mathematics, data and algorithms are shown as core across courses/ programs. Computer system and hardware and cybersecurity also formed a core topic across course/ programs. Soft-transferable skills also occur across programs, often combined into subjects with discipline material. The topics identified in the scoping review did not appear strongly in the curriculum review, with a lower number of courses showing inclusion of these topics. In particular, the topic of people and culture as identified in the scoping review was noted as included in only one course/ program in Australia. HCI and UI factors was also not strongly embedded in course/ program structure. Yet, courses often mentioned broad human factors topics such as sustainable design, general design or humanitarian design. While ethics had an increased mention in course/ program structures, the topics included within this broad theme varied greatly. In terms of teaching approaches, four main types appeared in the curriculum review (while not shown in the table). This included service learning, with project and workshop subjects also found. 'Placement' or 'internship' was mentioned by 10 out of 14 universities as a teaching in SE curriculum. Further to the review of Australian curriculum, the scoping review identified a number of

curriculum guidelines for undergraduate programs in software engineering [1, 8, 28, 30, 36, 37, 40]. The extent of human aspects in the curriculum varied for each program, as did the way in which the content was scaffolded. Overall, the below curriculum topics were suggested:

- (1) The nature of SE: Asks for a focus on the human issues in several software development scenarios, and awareness of SE in general to abstract human aspects. This also includes different perspectives on software development process, and viewpoints from other disciplines [15].
- (2) SE history: A focus on the historical aspects of SE and examples of how the lack of focus on human aspects has impacted SE processes and results [7].
- (3) SE methods: Asks for a focus on different methods and processes used for software development, e.g., the spiral model and extreme programming, to enable the reflection on using methods that are context appropriate [7].
- (4) International perspective on SE: Puts a focus on different cultures, the nature of SE worldwide, and gender and minority-related aspects in SE. While these factors are not directly related to the characteristics of the end user, they do

cover important human aspects for software development teams and other stakeholders [16].

- (5) Working in software teams: Requires an understanding of different software engineering roles and different types of team structures and application areas of principles and practices, e.g., projects-based units [7].
- (6) SE code of ethics: Considers risk management and ethical concerns in software engineering based on the Code of Ethics of SE [18]. Students need to be reflective of ethical concerns via storytelling activities and considering ethics at different levels of abstraction [38].
- (7) Software and SE's human aspects/ Software as a product: Describes human aspects of SE from a customer's perspective, different aspects of user characteristics and also the software as a 'qualified product' [21]. Customer's requirements are presented and thus likely to cover personal demographics and group characteristics of SE [2].
- (8) Program comprehension: Topics related to programming styles, code review, and the program comprehension levels. The students are asked to develop the same program at different levels of comprehension and abstraction and reflect on the differences [23].
- (9) SE learning processes: A focus on the importance of 'reflective process' and 'systems thinking' approach in SE. The students discuss and present different scenarios on the topics. Students should also exhibit problem-solving practices, e.g., understanding all the phases of the software development lifecycle and the skills required in each phase [7].
- (10) Software development principles: A specific focus on the abstraction and successive refinements in software development process. The students work on different examples presented to them by the teaching staff at different levels of abstraction. Students should also focus on tools, i.e., the state-of-the-art products for the application of principles and practices, e.g., practical skills in database management and programming environment tools [7].
- (11) Case study analysis: A focus on improving "awareness, sensitivity and analysis" skills, and the students present the case studies from different sources [25].

4 DISCUSSION

Through a scoping review of 36 papers, this study has addressed the research questions: What are the central human-centric topics that should be taught to undergraduate students when studying software engineering? This study also asked, what curriculum approaches are suitable to teach undergraduate human-centric software engineering? Table 2 summarises the five topics that should be embedded into a software engineering course to ensure human aspects are covered in the curriculum, with associated teaching methods. Note that Table 2 does not represent any order or topic preference, rather shows the top themes from analysis. Ethics appear as a topic required in SE, as ethical issues are closely aligned to the human aspects in SE. Ethical issues can be strategically woven over a course, using a variety of teaching methods to integrate content with project-based activities. Overall, knowledge of ethics can be integrated with the other topics identified, as understanding

human behaviour, eliciting requirements from different perspectives and the design of usable software systems must be considered within an ethically appropriate framework.

In relation to curriculum approach, numerous papers focused on broader curriculum approaches in SE, with varying degrees of human aspects as a part of the curriculum. Vliet [46] presents his reflections on SE curriculum in the Netherlands and the important facets missing from the SE programs in general. Vliet argues that the SE units need to be industry-oriented and the student should be made to learn requirements engineering (RE) techniques, as most students do not value RE and are usually poor at eliciting user requirements and unambiguously specifying them. Service-learning projects can be a viable option for teaching HCSE to students, as this would help students learn the underlying concepts of HCSE in an active learning environment [10, 11, 13, 15, 33, 34, 41].

4.1 Recommendations for the Software Engineering Curriculum

To embed a human-centered approach in teaching and learning of software engineering a greater focus on sign-posting of requirements engineering and inclusion of human factors is needed in course learning outcomes and curriculum structures. The topic of people and culture needs to be included throughout the curriculum, with both individual and group-based learning approaches required to ensure students are engaging in software engineering from both an introspective and externally validated learning perspective. In Australia, a placement or internship is a strong teaching and learning approach in software engineering courses, critically linking students with the software engineering profession. Yet more broadly embedding human factors and soft skills should occur across the curriculum.

4.2 Threats to Validity

The scoping review and curriculum review process may be subject to issues of content and criterion validity. While both processes attempted to collect available information, the search criteria and available information collected may not represent a detailed understanding of topics and curriculum approaches.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Grundy et al's definition of human-centric software engineering [21] focuses on personal demographic characteristics, skill or expertise-based characteristics and group characteristics as important human aspects to consider. The scoping review has highlighted similarly in topics and approaches to Grundy's approach [21], however focuses more on making some topics explicit, such as ethics, requirement engineering, user centred methods for human computer interaction, and requirements engineering. To integrate the topics identified in this scoping review, along with Grundy's characteristics, a variety of teaching methods along with a structured curriculum with opportunities for service learning is required. In the Australian curriculum, greater engagement with human centred topics, as identified in the scoping review, should be incorporated into course learning outcomes and subject scaffolding to ensure human-centered software engineering topics are central to course outcomes. The paper currently focuses on the Australian context. In future work, we plan

to expand this to a global scale, comparing how different countries incorporate HCSE in their curricula. In addition, we will investigate the development of an assessment framework to evaluate the effectiveness of HCSE education in the next body of work.

6 DATA AVAILABILITY

The supplementary materials accompanying this paper contain 1) the summary of results from the scoping review and 2) the data gathered from Australian educational institutions for the purpose of Curriculum Review. This dataset includes 1) information drawn from each of the 36 papers included in the review, and 2) information on the specific courses and their respective universities considered, as well as a summary of the results from the coding process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rick Adcock, Edward Alef, Bruce Amato, Mark Ardis, Larry Bernstein, Barry Boehm, Pierre Bourque, John Brackett, Murray Cantor, Lillian Cassel, Robert Edson, Richard Fairley, Dennis Frailey, Gary Hafen, Thomas Hilburn, Greg Hislop, David Klappholz, Philippe Kruchten, Phil Laplante, Qiaoyun (Liz) Li, Scott Lucero, John McDermid, James McDonald, Ernest McDuffie, Bret Michael, William Milam, Ken Nidiffer, Art Pyster, Paul Robitaille, Mary Shaw, Sarah Sheard, Robert Surtis, Massood Towhidnejad, Richard Thayer, J Barrie Thompson, Guilherme Travassos, Richard Turner, Joseph Urban, Ricardo Valerdi, Osmo Vikman, David Weiss, and Mary Jane Willshire. 2009. Curriculum Guidelines for Graduate Degree Programs in Software Engineering.
- [2] Faheem Ahmed, Piers Campbell, Ahmad Jaffar, Shayma Alkobaisi, and Julie Campbell. 2010. Innovations in Practice Learning & Personality Types: A Case Study of a Software Design Course.
- [3] Mark Ardis, Stephen Chenoweth, and Frank Young. 2008. The "Soft" Topics in Software Engineering Education. *38th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*.
- [4] Muneera Bano, Chetan Arora, Didar Zowghi, and Alessio Ferrari. 2021. The Rise and Fall of COVID-19 Contact-Tracing Apps: when NFRs Collide with Pandemic. *2021 IEEE 29th International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE)*, 106–116. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RE51729.2021.00017>
- [5] Muneera Bano, Didar Zowghi, and Chetan Arora. 2021. Requirements, Politics, or Individualism: What Drives the Success of COVID-19 Contact-Tracing Apps? *IEEE Software* 38 (1 2021), 7–12. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2020.3029311>
- [6] Bruno R. Bessa, Simone Santos, and Breno J. Duarte. 2019. Toward effectiveness and authenticity in PBL: A proposal based on a virtual learning environment in computing education. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education* 27 (3 2019), 452–471. Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22088>
- [7] Klaus Bothe, Zoran Budimac, Rebeca Cortazar, Mirjana Ivanović, and Hussein Zedan. 2009. Development of a modern curriculum in software engineering at master level across Countries. *Computer Science and Information Systems* 6 (6 2009), 1–21. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.2298/CSIS0901001B>
- [8] Alejandro Calderón, Mercedes Ruiz, and Antonio Falcón. 2016. SmartProject: an Environment for Software Engineering Teaching Based on Serious Games and Social Networks. *10th European Conference on Games Based Learning*.
- [9] Joseph Chao and Jennifer Brown. 2009. Cross-Departmental Collaboration for the Community: Technical Communicators in a Service-Learning Software Engineering Course. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology* 6 (2009). <http://agile.bgsu.edu>
- [10] Joseph Chao and Mark Randles. 2009. Agile Software Factory for Student Service Learning. *2009 22nd Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training*, 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSSEET.2009.26>
- [11] Joseph T. Chao and Jennifer K. Brown. 2009. Empowering Students and the Community through Agile Software Development Service-Learning. 104–113. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-01853-4_13
- [12] Torkil Clemmensen and Jacob Nørbjerg. 2003. Separation in theory, coordination in practice - teaching HCI and SE. *Software Process: Improvement and Practice* 8 (4 2003), 99–110. Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/spip.173>
- [13] Fernández DL, Raya L, Ortega F, and García JJ. 2019. Project based learning meets service learning on software development education. *The International journal of engineering education* 35 (2019), 1436–1445. Issue 5.
- [14] Carlos dos Santos PORTELA, Alexandre Marcos Lins de VASCONCELOS, Sandro Ronaldo Bezerra OLIVEIRA, and Mauricio Ronny de Almeida SOUZA. 2021. An Empirical Study on the Use of Student-Focused Approaches in the Software Engineering Teaching. *Informatics in Education* (4 2021). <https://doi.org/10.15388/infedu.2021.13>
- [15] Joanna C Dunlap. 2005. Problem-Based Learning and Self-Efficacy: How a Capstone Course Prepares Students for a Profession. *Educational technology research and development* 53 (2005), 65–85. Issue 1.
- [16] David Foster, Filippo Gilardi, Paul Martin, Wei Song, Dave Towey, and Andrew White. 2018. Students as co-producers in a multidisciplinary software engineering project: addressing cultural distance and cross-cohort handover. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* 24 (10 2018), 840–853. Issue 7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1486295>
- [17] Ivan Garcia, Carla Pacheco, Francisco Méndez, and Jose A. Calvo-Manzano. 2020. The effects of game-based learning in the acquisition of "soft skills" on undergraduate software engineering courses: A systematic literature review. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education* 28 (9 2020), 1327–1354. Issue 5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22304>
- [18] Don Gotterbarn, Keith Miller, and Simon Rogerson. 1997. Software engineering code of ethics. *Commun. ACM* 40 (11 1997), 110–118. Issue 11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/265684.265699>
- [19] John Grundy, Hourieh Khalajzadeh, and Jennifer McIntosh. 2020. Towards Human-centric Model-driven Software Engineering. *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Evaluation of Novel Approaches to Software Engineering*, 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0009806002290238>
- [20] John Grundy, Hourieh Khalajzadeh, Jennifer McIntosh, Tanjila Kanij, and Ingo Mueller. 2021. HumanISE: Approaches to Achieve More Human-Centric Software Engineering. *Communications in Computer and Information Science* 1375, 444–468. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70006-5_18
- [21] John Grundy, Ingo Mueller, Anuradha Madugalla, Hourieh Khalajzadeh, Humphrey Obie, Jennifer McIntosh, and Tanjila Kanij. 2022. Addressing the influence of end user human aspects on software engineering. Vol. 1556. <https://www.monash.edu/it/humanise-lab>
- [22] Omar Haggag, Sherif Haggag, John Grundy, and Mohamed Abdelrazek. 2021. COVID-19 vs Social Media Apps: Does Privacy Really Matter? *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Society (ICSE-SEIS)*, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-SEIS52602.2021.00014>
- [23] Orit Hazzan. 2001. Teaching the human aspect of software engineering - a case study. *Proceedings of the thirty-second SIGCSE technical symposium on Computer Science Education*, 124–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/364447.364559>
- [24] Orit Hazzan. 2010. Putting Human Aspects of Software Engineering in University Curricula. *IEEE Software* 27 (7 2010), 90–91. Issue 4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2010.104>
- [25] Orit Hazzan and Jim Tomayko. 2005. Teaching human aspects of software engineering. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on Software engineering*. 647–648.
- [26] Orit Hazzan and James E. Tomayko. 2004. Reflection processes in the teaching and learning of human aspects of software engineering. *Software Engineering Education Conference, Proceedings* 17, 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.1109/csee.2004.1276507>
- [27] Orit Hazzan and James E. Tomayko. 2005. Reflection and abstraction in learning software engineering's human aspects. *Computer* 38 (6 2005), 39–45. Issue 6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2005.200>
- [28] Qing Hong, Wen Lu, Pengfei Feng, Haijun Wei, and Zhichao Cheng. 2015. Occupational Ability Oriented Graduate Education in Software Engineering. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)* 10 (12 2015), 25. Issue 8. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v10i8.5214>
- [29] Pankaj Kamthan. 2011. An Exploration of the Social Web Environment for Collaborative Software Engineering Education. *International Journal of Web-Based Learning and Teaching Technologies* 6 (4 2011), 18–39. Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.4018/jwlt.2011040102>
- [30] Timothy C Lethbridge. 2000. Priorities for the education and training of software engineers. *The Journal of Systems and Software* 53 (2000), 53–71. <http://www.cs.ttu.edu/fase>
- [31] Timothy C. Lethbridge. 2000. What knowledge is important to a software professional? *Computer* 33 (2000), 44–50. Issue 5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/2.841783>
- [32] Timothy C. Lethbridge, Richard J. Leblanc, Ann E. Kelley Sobel, Thomas B. Hilburn, and Jorge L. Diaz-Herrera. 2006. SE2004: Recommendations for undergraduate software engineering curricula. *IEEE Software* 23 (11 2006), 19–25. Issue 6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2006.171>
- [33] Panagiotis K. Linos, Stephanie Herman, and Julie Lally. 2003. A service-learning program for computer science and software engineering. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin* 35 (9 2003), 30–34. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/961290.961523>
- [34] Chang Liu. 2005. Enriching software engineering courses with service-learning projects and the open-source approach. *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on Software engineering - ICSE '05*, 613. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1062455.1062566>
- [35] Gerardo Maturro, Florencia Raschetti, and Carina Fontán. 2019. A Systematic Mapping Study on Soft Skills in Software Engineering. *Journal of Universal Computer Science* 25 (2019), 16–41. Issue 1.
- [36] Alok Mishra and Ali Yazici. 2011. AN ASSESSMENT OF THE SOFTWARE ENGINEERING CURRICULUM IN TURKISH UNIVERSITIES : IEEE/ACM GUIDELINES PERSPECTIVE. , 188–219 pages. Issue 1.

- [37] Christoph Müller, Guido Reina, Michael Burch, and Daniel Weiskopf. 2012. Large-scale visualization projects for teaching software engineering. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 32 (2012), 14–19. Issue 4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2012.81>
- [38] Arvind Narayanan and Shannon Vallor. 2014. Computing ethics why software engineering courses should include ethics coverage. *Commun. ACM* 57 (2014), 23–25. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2566966>
- [39] Klaus Pohl. 2010. *Requirements Engineering: Fundamentals, Principles, and Techniques*. Springer.
- [40] Arthur Pyster, Richard Turner, Devanandham Henry, Kahina Lasfer, and Lawrence Bernstein. 2009. Master’s Degrees in Software Engineering: An Analysis of 28 University Programs. *IEEE Software* (2009), 94–102.
- [41] Vincent Ribaud and Philippe Saliou. 2007. Towards an Ability Model for Software Engineering Apprenticeship. *Innovation in Teaching and Learning in Information and Computer Sciences* 6 (7 2007), 7–107. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.11120/ital.2007.06030097>
- [42] David R. Thomas. 2006. A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation* 27 (6 2006), 237–246. Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- [43] Elizabeth Towell. 2003. Teaching ethics in the software engineering curriculum. *Software Engineering Education Conference, Proceedings 2003-January*, 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSEE.2003.1191372>
- [44] Andrea C. Tricco, Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly K. O’Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle Levac, David Moher, Micah D.J. Peters, Tanya Horsley, Laura Weeks, Susanne Hempel, Elie A. Akl, Christine Chang, Jessie McGowan, Lesley Stewart, Lisa Hartling, Adrian Aldcroft, Michael G. Wilson, Chantelle Garritty, Simon Lewin, Christina M. Godfrey, Marilyn T. Macdonald, Etienne V. Langlois, Karla Soares-Weiser, Jo Moriarty, Tammy Clifford, Özge Tunçalp, and Sharon E. Straus. 2018. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169 (10 2018), 467–473. Issue 7. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- [45] Gerrit van der Veer and Hans van Vliet. 2003. A plea for a poor man’s HCI component in software engineering and computer science curricula; after all: The human-computer interface is the system. *International Journal of Phytoremediation* 21 (2003), 207–225. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1076/csed.13.3.207.14947>
- [46] Hans van Vliet. 2006. Reflections on software engineering education. *IEEE Software* 23 (5 2006), 55–61. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2006.80>