Journal of Health, Wellness and Community Research
ISSN: 3007, 0570

OPEN ACCESS

JHWCR

Type: Editorial
Published: 06 October 2025
Volume: III, **Issue:** XIV
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61919/5xvfv795

Correspondence
✉ Mahrukh Bhullar, mahrukh.bhullar@dhpt.uol.edu.pk
Anum Ashraf, anum.ashraf@drs.uol.edu.pk

Received 24, 08, 25 **Accepted** 04, 10, 2025

Authors' Contributions
MB and AA jointly conceived, drafted, revised, and approved the editorial.

Declarations
No funding was received for this study. The authors declare no conflict of interest. The study received ethical approval. All participants provided informed consent.

"Click to Cite"

Need for Incorporating Sustainable Development Goals into Graduate Curriculum Design

Mahrukh Bhullar[1], Anum Ashraf[2]

1 Operation Theatre Technologist, Demonstrator, Department of Health Professions Technology, The University of Lahore, Pakistan.
2 Speech-Language Pathologist, Assistant Professor, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Lahore, Pakistan.

EDITORIAL

The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer a coherent framework for tackling interlinked crises—poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, and fragility in health and social systems. Since their adoption in 2015, universities have been called to move beyond rhetorical alignment and embed sustainability into the structures that shape graduate education. This is not simply a matter of adding content; it is a redesign of purpose and practice. Graduate students sit at the inflection point between advanced training and societal influence. When curricula are intentionally mapped to the SDGs, graduates learn to translate disciplinary excellence into public value—framing problems systemically, evaluating trade-offs ethically, and working across sectors to produce durable solutions that matter outside the classroom (1–4).

The case for integration is both normative and empirical. Reviews consistently find that higher education influences the feasibility of SDG attainment through teaching, research, and community partnership (1–4). Yet the connection is uneven: integration efforts remain concentrated in selected disciplines and often at undergraduate levels, while graduate programs—where specialization deepens and leadership identities crystallize—are slower to reconfigure aims and assessments (3,4). The curricular remedy begins with systematic SDG-based mapping. By interrogating where courses already contribute (and where they do not), programs can expose gaps in sustainability competencies and recalibrate learning outcomes accordingly (1,2). This exercise is not a bureaucratic overlay; it is constructive alignment—linking outcomes, pedagogy, and assessment to the capabilities graduates actually need. The literature repeatedly highlights core competence domains: systems thinking to grapple with feedback loops and unintended consequences; ethical judgment to navigate equity, responsibility, and intergenerational impacts; and global citizenship to engage stakeholders, cultures, and contexts beyond the academy (1,4,6).

Pedagogy must match ambition. Approaches with strong support—problem- and project-based learning, design studios, and community-engaged courses—create authentic conditions where students confront messy data, contested values, and real constraints (3,5,7). Cross-disciplinary collaboration is not an accessory; it is a working method for sustainability, bringing engineers and economists together with public-health scholars, social scientists, and community actors to co-produce knowledge and interventions. Evidence from architecture and allied fields illustrates how SDG-aligned studios sharpen integrative reasoning and produce portfolios that demonstrate measurable societal relevance (7). Similar gains are reported in broader higher-education contexts when live briefs with external partners are embedded into capstones, practica, or thesis projects, enabling graduates to bridge theory and practice credibly (2,5).

Assessment is often the missing piece. Traditional evaluation captures technical proficiency but rarely registers growth in systems thinking, ethical discernment, or civic orientation—the very capacities that make graduates effective in complex settings (6). Programs should diversify evidence without sacrificing rigour: analytic memos that trace trade-off reasoning; design rationales that explain choices against SDG targets; stakeholder feedback from partner organizations; reflective artefacts linking scholarly literature to practice; and longitudinal tracking of project outcomes where feasible (3,6). At the program level, structural indicators can complement student-level evidence: the proportion of SDG-mapped courses; the density and quality of interdepartmental co-teaching; the scope and durability of external partnerships; and alignment between graduate research topics and SDG-salient problems (1–4,7). Such indicators create a feedback loop for iterative improvement rather than performative compliance.

Institutions will encounter friction. Faculty may resist on grounds of disciplinary purity or curricular overload; resources for redesign, partnership management, and assessment innovation are finite; and non-cognitive outcomes remain difficult to measure reliably (2,5,6). These barriers are real, but the literature is clear about what helps: visible leadership, time-bound goals for curriculum renewal, and incentives that recognise SDG-aligned teaching and collaborative scholarship in workload models and promotion criteria (2,6). Faculty development is pivotal—not one-off workshops, but communities of practice with instructional design support, micro-grants for course conversion, and shared repositories of cases, rubrics, and partner briefs (2,5). Partnerships with municipalities, health systems, NGOs, and industry anchor learning in consequential contexts and diversify funding streams, while also exposing students to the governance and implementation realities that can make or break sustainability initiatives (2,5,7).

Crucially, integration must respect disciplinary depth. The objective is not to homogenise graduate education around a generic sustainability syllabus, but to connect specialisation to societal purpose through shared language and collaborative practice. An engineering MSc can retain rigorous design analytics while requiring life-cycle assessment and stakeholder analysis; a public-health MPH can pair epidemiological modelling with equity impact assessments and community governance frameworks; a rehabilitation sciences program can link clinical outcomes to SDG

targets on health, inclusion, and decent work. Across these examples, the SDGs operate as a scaffold for coherence, not a constraint on scholarly freedom (1–4,6).

The opportunity cost of inaction is high. Graduate programmes that remain siloed risk producing experts who are technically adept yet ill-equipped for the political, ethical, and intersectoral realities in which their decisions unfold. By contrast, SDG-aligned curricula elevate education from transmission to stewardship. They prepare graduates to ask better questions, design fairer systems, and justify choices in language legible to policymakers, communities, and investors alike. They also multiply research impact: when thesis projects and lab agendas are intentionally framed against SDG-relevant questions, scholarly contributions more readily translate into policy pilots, clinical protocols, design standards, and scalable innovations (1–4,7).

A practical path forward is within reach. Within a single academic cycle, programmes can (a) complete an SDG curriculum map and revise outcomes to include systems thinking, ethical judgment, and stakeholder engagement; (b) convert at least one core course or capstone into an authentic, partnered, SDG-linked project; (c) provide targeted support and recognition for faculty leading the transition; and (d) institute mixed-method assessment and programme-level indicators that inform continuous improvement (1–6). These moves do not dilute academic standards; they clarify them, aligning scholarly excellence with public purpose.

We contend that integrating SDGs into graduate curricula is both a moral and strategic necessity. It equips emerging leaders to navigate uncertainty with intellectual humility and ethical clarity, to collaborate across boundaries, and to deliver solutions that endure. Done well, it does not add to curricular burden so much as rearticulate why advanced education exists: to generate knowledge with consequence and to form professionals capable of stewarding people and planet. In the decade ahead, the universities that embrace this work will not only educate experts—they will cultivate trustees of the future (1–7).

REFERENCES

1. Rajabifard A, Kahalimoghadam M, Lumantarna E, Herath N, Hui FKP, Assarkhaniki Z. Applying SDGs as a systematic approach for incorporating sustainability in higher education. Int J Sustain High Educ. 2021;22(6):1266-1284.
2. Gregori-Giralt E, Benítez-Robles C, Menéndez-Varela JL. Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals in the Curricula of University Degrees: Initial Steps. Sustainability. 2025;17(14):6355.
3. Christensen J, Ekelund N, Åberg A, et al. Exploring Sustainable Development Goals and Curriculum Adoption: A Scoping Review from 2020–2025. Societies. 2025;15(8):212.
4. Chankseliani M, McCowan T. Integrating the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals into higher education globally: a scoping review. Glob Health Action. 2023;16(1):2190649.
5. Bataeineh M, Aga O. Integrating sustainability into higher education curricula: Saudi Vision 2030. Emerald Open Res. 2023;1(3).
6. Sinakou E, Boeve-de Pauw J, Van Petegem P. Exploring the concept of sustainable development within education for sustainable development: implications for ESD research and practice. Environ Educ Res. 2019;25(4):508-531.
7. García-Almirall P, Hendawy M, Akhtar MJ, et al. Integrating Sustainable Development Goals into the Architecture Curriculum: Experiences and Perspectives. City Environ Interact. 2024;21:100138.