

MUDD DESIGN WORKSHOP VI

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World

Proceedings of a Workshop

23-25 May 2007


Clive L. Dym, Editor

DESIGN

Center for Design Education

Harvey Mudd College

Claremont, California, USA



Foreword

The papers on this compact disk (CD) represent the proceedings of Mudd Design Workshop V, "Learning and Engineering Design," which was held on the campus of Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, California, during 19–21 May 2005. Supported by The Boeing Company and Harvey Mudd College's Department of Engineering, this workshop brought together engineers — both educators and practitioners — and social scientists over three very busy days to discuss learning, cognition, and assessment in engineering education .

A broad variety of engineering education issues were discussed. Sessions were devoted to: engineering as a profession; learning in design and in engineering education; definitions of design knowledge; design, inquiry, and learning; inspiring learning in design courses; assessment of learning in design courses; and a (small) cornucopia of programmatic and institutional issues. Major emergent themes included the need for engineers to educate the public and their policy makers about the processes of engineering; that research into engineering learning must be conducted by (at least in part) and recognized by engineering faculty; that design can motivate and enhance the place of values and ethics in undergraduate curricula; and that positive change is emerging in engineering education, notwithstanding the formidable and enduring barriers to such change. Before leaving, participants converged on a set of goals that they would try to advance — both individually and collectively.

Following the tradition established at MDWs I–IV, the workshop sessions were constructed to give *everyone* a chance to participate, to be heard as well as to listen. Workshop sessions were typically scheduled for two hours, starting with brief presentations by three or four panelists in each session, and concluding with moderated, open discussion. Panelists were asked to reflect on ideas and attitudes about things to be done in the future, rather focusing on their own current research. The papers that appear here are (for the most part) the panelists' research and position papers. Clearly, these papers represent a rich body of experience and knowledge that certainly advance our understanding of the many meanings of *learning* in the context of *engineering design*.

At the opening lunch Clive Dym briefly suggested that learning and design are both very complex subjects, outlined some of the facets of design thinking, and noted that the benefits associated with teaching design are increasingly seen as the primary goals of engineering education. Our keynote speaker, at the same luncheon, was James W. Pellegrino, Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. In his talk, "Engineering the Design of Learning Environments for Engineering Design: Can the Psychology of Learning and Assessment Help?", Jim described some recent research results on learning, as well as their implications for institutional teaching and assessment. He also emphasized the importance of cognitive findings about how students (and people) represent knowledge and develop competence in their domains. Jim ended by placing instructional research in the context of Pasteur's theory-and-application quadrant, pointing out that no name was as yet identified for the quadrant high in both theory and application in this context! Jim's abstract and PowerPoint slides are on the CD.

We were once again fortunate in having two outstanding after-dinner events. In the first, Chaplains Ton Meijknecht and Hans von Drongelen of *Motiv* of the Technical University of Delft engaged the evening audience with a colorful exposition about how a student at Delft identified and articulated her own spirituality in her senior design project. Ton and Hans then went on to lead a wonderfully stimulating discussion of how educators might stimulate student awareness of spirituality in engineering education. At our Friday banquet, Penn State's Professor John S. Lamancusa engaged the audience by thoughtfully delineating the challenges of meaningful

curricular reform —especially including the introduction of new design courses — in his talk, “Design as the Bridge Between Theory and Practice.” John’s PowerPoint slides are available on this CD, as are both his paper and one by Chaplains Meijknecht and von Drongelen .

I want to acknowledge once again the support of the remaining members of MDW V’s Organizing Committee. They worked hard to maintain the MDW’s reputation for providing an informative, stimulating and inspiring venue for discussing engineering education: Alice M. Agogino, University of California at Berkeley; Cindy J. Atman, University of Washington; Philip E. Doepker, University of Dayton; Larry J. Leifer, Stanford University; John McMasters, The Boeing Company; Gregory B. Olson, Northwestern University; John W. Prados, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Sheri D. Sheppard, Stanford University; and John W. Wesner, Carnegie Mellon University. The Organizing Committee’s involvement led to another MDW that was stimulating, thought-provoking and interesting, as well as being serious, engaging and fun.

Finally, Harvey Mudd College continues to offer the MDWs a very supportive environment. Tony Bright, Chair of the Department of Engineering, deserves my thanks, as do Interim Dean of Faculty Thomas M. Helliwell, President Jon Strauss, and College Relations’ Sally Rich Arroyo. But most of all, I *vigorously* and *cheerfully* thank Sue Lindley and Daniel Pereira of the Department of Engineering and Cathy Corder of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. Brian Kirkpatrick (HMC ’07) also deserves thanks for implementing Sue’s design of our “deliverables,” brilliantly maintaining “the MDW look and feel” for the MDW series, including this CD, and for the Center for Design Education (CDE) web site. Cathy provided both editorial and logistical assistance, working with Dan and Sue to make the MDW V trains run on time. Thanks as well to Cynthia Wheeler for ensuring that our vendors got paid and our accounts were balanced. Lastly, of course, I thank our generous benefactors once more: The Boeing Company and Harvey Mudd College’s Department of Engineering.

Clive L. Dym
Director, Center for Design Education
Harvey Mudd College
Claremont CA 91711-5990
clive_dym@hmc.edu

Contents

Special Issue

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World

Guest Editor

Clive L. Dym, Harvey-Mudd College

M. S. Wald	211	Editorial
C. L. Dym	212–213	Guest Editorial
C. L. Dym	214–220	Educating Engineers for a Flat World
C. Scolese and E. J. Hoffman	221–225	Design Engineering Education and Space Exploration in a Flat World
<i>Assessing Flat World Skills</i>		
R. Bailey	226–233	Comparative Study of Undergraduate and Practicing Engineer Knowledge of the Roles of Problem Definition and Idea Generation in Design
C. J. Atman, K. Yasuhara, R. S. Adams T. J. Barker, J. Turns and E. Rhone	234–245	Breadth in Problem Scoping: a Comparison of Freshman and Senior Engineering Students
M. E. Cardella, C. J. Atman, J. Turns and R. S. Adams	246–259	Students with Differing Design Processes as Freshmen: Case Studies on Change
M. V. Manuel, A. F. McKenna and G. B. Olson	260–265	Hierarchical Model for Coaching Technical Design Teams
<i>Flat World Teaching and Design Tools</i>		
D. Guerra-Zubiaga, H. Elizalde, C. I. Rivera, R. Morales-Menendez and R. Ramirez	266–273	Product Life-Cycle Management Tools and Collaborative Tools applied to an Automotive Case Study
D. Schaefer, J. H. Panchal, S-K. Choi and F. Mistree	274–282	Strategic Design of Engineering Education for the Flat World
J. Hey, J. Linsey, A. M. Agogino and K. L. Wood	283–294	Analogies and Metaphors in Creative Design
<i>Cross Cultural Considerations</i>		
G. E. Okudan, H. Thevenot, Y. Zhang and M. Schuurman	295–303	Cultures and Systems of Thought: a Preliminary Investigation on Implications for the Design Process and its Artifacts
D. F. Ollis, A. Kennedy, M. Granger and R. Brent	304–313	Addressing 'Engineering Solutions in Global and Societal Context' Through an Integrated Foreign Language Immersion Experience
P. Little, D. Barney and R. Hink	314–327	Living Up to the Code: Engineering as Political Judgment
E. González, D. Guerra-Zubiaga, P. Orta and M. Contero	328–335	Cross Cultural Issues on Globally Dispersed Design Team Performance: The PACE Project Experiences
<i>International Curricula</i>		
C. L. Magee, J. D. Ringo and A. M. Cunha	336–344	Engineering Design and Product Development: a focus of the MIT-Portugal Programme
N. T. Kirkland, V. L. Vitanov and D. Schaefer	345–356	An Investigation into Using Current Information Technologies to Provide Engineering Education to Sub-Saharan Africa
M. M. Mehalik, M. Lovell and L. Shuman	357–366	Product Realization for Global Opportunities: Learning Collaborative Design in an International Setting
P. L. Skogstad, R. M. Currano and L. J. Leifer	367–376	An Experiment in Design Pedagogy Transfer Across Cultures and Disciplines
<i>Communication and Teamwork</i>		
P. L. Hirsch and A. F. McKenna	377–385	Using Reflection to Promote Teamwork Understanding in Engineering Design Education
L. D. McNair, M. C. Paretto and A. Kakar	386–399	Case Study of Prior Knowledge: Expectations and Identity Constructions in Interdisciplinary, Cross-cultural Virtual Collaboration
M. C. Yang and Y. Jin	400–408	An Examination of Team Effectiveness in Distributed and Co-located Engineering Teams

Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Design

- J. P. Terpenney, R. M. Goff, W. K. Lohani, J. Mullin and J. Lo** 409–419 Preparing Globally and Socially-conscious Engineers: International and Human-centred Design Projects and Activities in the First Year
- C. L. Cobb, A. M. Agogino, S. L. Beckman and L. Speer** 420–433 Enabling and Characterizing Twenty-First Century Skills in New Product Development Teams
- B. Hariharan, S. Shariq and S. Sheppard** 434–442 When Understanding Follows ‘Experiencing’: A Report from Research in the Field
- J. W. Wesner and C. L. Dym** 443–448 What We Have Learned at Mudd Design Workshop VI, ‘Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World’

Editorial

Engineering Education communities?

In order to establish engineering education research an engineering education research community needs to be existent. Evidence for this community, which is an integral part of any established research discipline, is not yet discernible. The creation of engineering education departments, and the increased emphasis on interdisciplinary connections, studies and globalization of dissemination and cooperation activities is a sign that something is brewing in the direction of a community of engineering education which tries to find its feet. There are however, a number of perturbations to the growing together of an engineering education research community. First, and to my mind foremost—there is too little coherence between the varying constituents and stakeholders—there is no clear repository of accumulated research and there is no accepted definition of what engineering education research is really supposed to be about. Conferences on engineering education have mushroomed in recent years. Still, almost all of these are compartmentalised, and attended by a non-coherent group of academics. There is little cross fertilization between the various organisations sponsoring such conferences. The impression is that they are competing in different markets. The American Society for Engineering Education—the largest of these organisational sponsors is still, in spite of efforts to go global—very much a US affair, similarly the European Society of Engineering Education. Then there are other competing organisers such as ICEE (iNEER) as well as the various professional societies—where IEEE is in the forefront. Even with these organisations, there are competing elements within the organisations between the education branches and the subject specific branches for engineering education conferences and individual sessions. Unless we can establish a world community of engineering education research where the stakeholders are defined and well versed in each others work we cannot yet claim that engineering education research is an established discipline or multidisciplinary legitimate research area. It needs to be recognized by sponsoring and funding organizations that investment in engineering education research in order to optimize the education systems for engineers is a sound investment as good as any sound investment in university research.

One consistently valuable thematic conference on engineering education is the Harvey-Mudd workshop which takes place bi-annually in Claremont California. It gathers top researchers and enthusiasts around topics related to engineering design. This issue, containing updated and revised papers from the conference, is continuing the series of issues emanating from this excellent, compact and intensive conference. The leading organiser of these workshops is Clive Dym who consistently manages to collect leading scientists in a pleasant location just outside Los Angeles. I am most grateful to Clive, the organisers and the authors contributing to this issue for the varied and intriguing contributions.

Michael Wald

Postscript:

We have just learned that John McMasters, one of the motors of the Harvey-Mudd workshops is no longer with us. John had a very special educational mission at Boeing—holding a unique position as an engineering educator in industry. He was a brilliant and visionary engineer based in the design arena. He was broadly educated with many interests in engineering and the humanities. A brilliant presenter, he was also noted for his humour and cartoonist gifts. He is often referred to in this issue. He was a regular contributor and supporter of this journal.

He is sadly missed.

Guest Editorial

The papers in this special issue of the *International Journal of Engineering Education* represent much of the proceedings of Mudd Design Workshop VI, "Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World," which was held on the campus of Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, California, during 23–25 May 2007. Supported by Harvey Mudd College's Department of Engineering and Center for Design Education, this workshop brought together engineers and designers—both educators and practitioners—over three very busy days to talk about how globalization issues are affecting engineering design education.

A broad variety of engineering education issues was discussed. The first formal session was a panel discussion on the two recent reports, *The Engineer of 2020* (NAE) and *The Gathering Storm* (NRC). Presided over by Professor John W. Prados, the panel discussion featured a brief introduction by Professor Dym and extended presentations of an industry perspective by Mr. Carl Carrera (HMC '75/76) of Boeing and an academic perspective by Berkeley's Professor Alice M. Agogino. All of these presentations are on the CD. It is also worth noting that panelist Carrera was filling in for a longtime supporter and organizer of the MDW series, Dr. John McMasters. (Dr. McMasters could not be at MDW VI, but he was sorely missed and his presence was felt during the ensuing panel discussion and the rest of the workshop. The next six sessions were devoted to: assessing flat world skills; flat world teaching and design tools; cross-cultural considerations; multinational curricula; communication and teamwork; and social entrepreneurship and sustainable design. The eighth (and last) session focused on identifying themes that had emerged and actions that might be taken both individually and institutionally.

Major emergent themes included the need to identify the integrative skills that students need to acquire (and that graduates and their institutions can use to differentiate themselves in their respective market-places); that tools and techniques for assessment are available and are being improved; that the skill types and levels of graduates is changing—and needs to change—in response to external changes; that students should be exposed to foreign cultures, as well as languages, and that cross-cultural courses and experiences are increasingly valuable components of engineering education; that collaboration and communication are increasingly important; that engineering faculty must be committed to these new emphases; that systems-level engineers (i.e., those who can appreciate and configure systems) are hard to find in practice and on engineering faculties; and, finally, that engineers should be more aware not only that their actions need to be ethical, but also that they are in fact making political (in the broadest meaning of the word) statements with their work, by the very nature of the projects that they are willing to undertake and complete. Before leaving, participants converged on various goals that they would try to advance—both individually and collectively. These are summarized in the wrap-up paper by J. W. Wesner's and C. L. Dym (below).

At the MDW VI opening lunch the keynote speaker, Christopher J. Scolese, Chief Engineer of the NASA, talked on, "Design and Engineering Education For Space Exploration in a Flat World." Mr. Scolese described the history of international collaboration in many of NASA's major endeavors, pointing out that space exploration has always been "globalized," and also pointing to the educational demands made upon engineers practicing in this domain.

We were once again fortunate to have two outstanding after-dinner events. In the first, HMC's President, Dr. Maria Klawe, led the evening audience in a colorful and stimulating discussion directed toward understanding of the meaning and implications of Thomas L. Friedman's now-famous *flat world* phrase. At Thursday's banquet, Professor Bernard Roth of Stanford gave us some personal "Reflections on Design Thinking." Among many provocative points, he distinguished between *trying* to do something and (actually!) *doing* something, and reminded us that students are not just vessels to be filled by the teaching professor. Rather, they are students who need to experience their mown experiences and to develop their own stories.

Following the long-established MDW tradition, the workshop sessions were constructed to give *everyone* a chance to participate, to be heard as well as to listen. Workshop sessions were typically scheduled for two hours, starting with brief presentations by three or four panelists in each session, and concluding with moderated, open discussion. Panelists were asked to reflect on ideas and attitudes about things to be done in the future, rather focusing on their own current research. The papers that appear here are (for the most part) the panelists' research and position papers. Clearly, these papers represent a rich body of experience and knowledge that certainly advance our understanding of the many meanings of *learning* in the context of *engineering design*.

I want to acknowledge once again the support of the remaining members of MDW V's Organizing Committee. They worked hard to maintain the MDW's reputation for providing an informative,

stimulating and inspiring venue for discussing engineering education: Alice M. Agogino, *University of California at Berkeley*; Cindy J. Atman, *University of Washington*; J. Edward Colgate, *Northwestern University*; Philip E. Doepker, *University of Dayton*; John S. Lamancusa, *Pennsylvania State University*; Larry J. Leifer, *Stanford University*; John McMasters, *The Boeing Company*; Gregory B. Olson, *Northwestern University*; John W. Prados, *University of Tennessee, Knoxville*; Sheri D. Sheppard, *Stanford University*; and John W. Wesner, *Carnegie Mellon University*. The Organizing Committee's involvement once again led to an MDW that was stimulating, thought-provoking and interesting, as well as being serious, engaging and fun.

Finally, Harvey Mudd College continues to offer the MDWs a very supportive environment. Professors Anthony Bright and Ziyad H. Duron, respectively previous and current Chair(s) of the Department of Engineering, deserve my thanks, as do President Klawe and former Dean of Faculty Daniel L. Goroff. I *particularly* and *vigorously* and *cheerfully* thank Sue Lindley and Daniel Pereira of the Department of Engineering for unflagging organizational, logistical, editorial and administrative contributions. Mr. Kevin Mapp of HMC's Department of College Relations took many photos during MDW VI, three of which appear in my opening paper. Thanks as well to HMC's Cynthia Wheeler for ensuring that our vendors got paid and our books were balanced.

Clive L. Dym
Fletcher Jones Professor of Engineering Design
Director, Center for Design Education
Harvey Mudd College
Claremont CA 91711-5990
clive_dym@hmc.edu

Just as this Special Issue was going to press we learned that John McMasters had passed away. Many of John's colleagues and friends have paid homage to John's intelligence, vision, thoughtfulness, and vibrant and humorous style. John was not only a good friend to the Mudd Design Workshops, but also to me personally. I will miss him a lot, and I'm quite sure that every future MDW will follow this one in noting both sadly and fondly the void that his absence will create.

Educating Engineers for a Flat World*

CLIVE L. DYM

Department of Engineering, Harvey Mudd College, 301 Platt Boulevard, Claremont, CA 91711–5990,
USA. E-mail: clive_dym@hmc.edu

This paper encompasses and extends remarks made at the opening of a workshop on engineering and design education in a flat world by the workshop's organizing committee's chair. Held at Harvey Mudd College in May 2007, and supported by Mudd's Center for Design Education, Mudd Design Workshop VI brought together engineers and designers—in their roles as educators, researchers and practitioners interested in learning and in design—to identify and articulate important flat world issues in design and engineering education. The remarks detailed below were intended to highlight some of the issues that arise due to globalization and a developing flat world, as well as to raise some questions about what engineering educators might do that could be addressed by the workshop's presentations and discussions. While some aspects of these remarks may well have been in the vein of preaching to the converted about issues of design teaching, it is also noted herein that the many benefits associated with teaching design—which are increasingly seen as meeting many of the primary goals of engineering education—are equally relevant—if not more so—in the context of engineering education in a flat world.

Keywords: design pedagogy; design practice; globalization; flat world; design research

INTRODUCTION

The engineer is concerned with how things ought to be—ought to be, that is, in order to attain goals and to function.

Herbert A. Simon

WE ARE HERE, at this sixth Mudd Design Workshop, to figure out what ought to be the goals toward which we should strive in our engineering curricula in the face of unprecedented changes in the worlds in which we teach and in which our graduates will practice. First and foremost, at least for this discussion, are the changes due to globalization. Thomas L. Friedman, the noted foreign affairs columnist of *The New York Times*, has brought globalization to the forefront of the public's attention, in both clearly explaining its development [1] and successfully detailing how India, China other countries became part of the global supply chain of both manufacturing and services [2]. In so doing, Friedman has also made the phrase flat world a staple of our daily discussions of topics as varied as economics, foreign policy, and education. The sixth Mudd Design Workshop (MDW VI) was intended to extend the reach of prior workshops [3–7] to explore the impacts of globalization and the flattening of the world—or, to borrow another Friedman metaphor, the levelling of the playing field—on engineering education in general and on design education in particular. (Of course, for those of us who believe in Simon's dictum that design is the central feature of engineering [8], the general and the particular are the same.) Thus, we go on to

articulate some of the signposts that indicate how the educational environment is being changed by the flattening of our world.

SIGNS OF A CHANGING, FLATTENING WORLD

There are many indicators that point to changes in the environments in which we engineers (in particular) live, are educated, and practice. Some indicators reflect the vast growth of knowledge, which itself often seems to follow Gordon Moore's famous heuristic about the doubling of computer processing capability. One such indicator that will certainly appeal to academics is a simple count of journals over, say, the last forty years. If we look just at three major professional societies (the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE)), we can find the data shown in Table 1. These data show significant increases in the number of journals, without showing similar increases in the numbers of pages published by these journals, and without listing at all the hundreds—if not thousands—of proprietary journals that simply did not exist forty or fifty years ago.

We can identify another set of indicators of the changing environment in the several *qualitative changes in the technologies* that drive much of our individual and our societies' activities:

- We have far more devices and artifacts in our lives than any of us would have been imagined in the era immediately after World War II. Exam-

* Accepted 13 January 2008.

Table 1. Growth in journals published by selected professional societies

	1962	2002
ASCE Journals	17	29
ASME Journals	5	20
IEEE Journals	39	87

ples include computers, ranging from micro and handheld to super, wireless communication devices, surgical robots, nanoscale devices, genetically engineered drugs, and more.

- We also have many more processes and tools for representing and disseminating information, which has led in turn to both the dispersal and democratization of knowledge.
- The dispersal and democratization of knowledge has produced, in parallel, both the empowerment of individuals and the commoditization of tasks.

These technological changes and their consequences provide the foundations for Friedman's triple convergence [2] of forces and activities that characterize the flat world under discussion. In fact, Friedman tells an iconic story that is familiar to any frequent flyer, and especially those of us who routinely fly on Southwest Airlines. In the not-too-distant past, we would call or visit a travel agent or an airline to arrange a trip—and from whom we would obtain 'real', 'hard-copy' tickets. Friedman terms these (good?) old days as Globalization 1.0. The next stage, Globalization 2.0, emerged when we could call the airline and book our tickets over the phone. We would then retrieve them at the airport, shortly before flight time, by inserting our (identifying) credit cards into electronic ticketing kiosks. Friedman then describes how he arrived at an airport well in advance of—one and one-half hours before—a Southwest flight in order to ensure that he would get a prized 'A' boarding pass. Much to his consternation the kiosk issued only a 'B' boarding pass. While standing in the 'B' line both puzzled and irritated at his misfortune, Friedman noted that many of the passengers in the 'A' line had tickets printed on full-size pieces of paper, rather than the cardboard pass produced by the kiosk. This observation inspired Friedman's realization that we had entered Globalization 3.0: We are each our own travel agents, as which we not only make reservations and pay for our tickets over a web interface, we actually print them out ourselves!

This little story embodies the triple convergence of economic forces that Friedman identifies as the basis of the flat world, of the new and level playing field [2]:

- We see the emergence of new flattening forces that are heralded by the emergence of a knowledge society in which value is created horizontally, rather than vertically. The power of these flattening forces are both enabled and reinforced

by "steroids" in computer usage at all levels. In the case of Friedman's story, these forces are clearly evident in the roles of both computers and the world-wide web.

- We see also the development of new business habits wherein both individuals and companies respond to the emerging flattening forces. In Friedman's parable, Southwest Airlines develops a new relationship with its customers by exploiting computational capabilities and the accessibility of the world-wide web.
- And, consequently, we witness as well populations of new players in China, India and the former Soviet empire. Similarly, we also note that this is the wave of an almost certain future trend in which still more new populations of players will also appear on the world economic stage. Friedman points to the widespread adoption by US customers of Southwest's new business model that presaged the emergence of new populations once the new capabilities for capturing and applying knowledge began to propagate over our once-round globe.

John H. McMasters has identified a perfect storm of forces that also reflect major changes in the environment, albeit at a somewhat different level of abstraction than Friedman's analysis. McMasters' perfect storm, which we might also call a quadruple convergence, identifies the following four major components that are also depicted in Fig. 1 [9].

- global warming (and the role that human activity plays in fostering it), which is now, apparently (and finally?) accepted and understood as the major—and in some sense perhaps the—environmental challenge facing the world;
- a rapidly growing world population and its concomitant demographics, as a result of which many countries and regions are faced with disproportionately large populations of young people who need not only food and shelter, but also education, and for whom jobs must be provided in economies that are not growing nearly fast enough;
- our increasing awareness of the finite supply of natural resources such as oil, water (especially potable water) and a variety of minerals (including soil); and
- that many of our institutions and cultures are either unable or unwilling to change or to otherwise respond positively to the other three converging trends of this perfect storm.

Some of the indicators of the extent to which the changed environment in which engineering is both taught and practiced and changed are quantitative and have emerged to capture our attention in the wake of both the economic forces described by Friedman [1, 2], but also in the initial reactions by various institutions that are concerned with engineering, technology and science within the United States. Thus, the National Academy of Engineer-




Fig. 1. McMasters' depiction of the perfect storm [9].

ing (NAE) has published two studies on the future of engineering education in the US [10, 11] and the National Research Council (NRC) has published a study that examines more broadly the impact of the changes on the future of the US economy [12]. (Some of the premises underlying the NRC study have recently been called into question [13].) Without responding directly to any of these studies and findings, it does appear that they are consistent in presenting some numbers that seem simply startling, including:

- the number of U.S. bachelor's degrees in engineering (BSEs) as a share of total US baccalaureate degrees and in absolute counts has dropped from 7.8% (77,572) in 1985 to 4% (72,893) in 2004;
- China graduated more than 200,000 (44% of its total baccalaureates) in 2004 and is planning to increase that total to 1,000,000;
- of 2,800,000 first degrees in engineering and/or science granted world wide in 2004, 1,200,000 were awarded in Asian universities, 830,000 in Europe, and 400,000 in the US; and
- Asian universities produced eight (8!) times as many BSE degrees as do their American counterparts.

Now, as already noted, some of these numbers have already been questioned or challenged, for example, on the grounds of quality of the institutions and their respective programs, and even on the very accuracy of the numbers cited because of a lack of uniformity of counting standards [13]. And it is not our present purpose to either affirm or deny these findings, but only to note that they are part and parcel of present perceptions of the environment in which engineering education is taking place.

To bring this portion of our discussion to a close, we follow Friedman's lead [2] and observe that we, as engineering educators, must face that fact that we are preparing our graduates as future professionals who will practice engineering on a new, level playing field that is characterized by the facts that:

- there is geographically dispersed engineering talent that is almost instantaneously available across the world, and with whom our graduates must work and with whom they must also be able to compete;
- many engineering tasks have become commodities that can be outsourced to this geographically dispersed talent, as it already is to engineers in China, India and the former Soviet empire;
- US firms will retain engineers and engineering tasks stateside only if their results add value and if they can be used to differentiate themselves in the marketplace.

This is the marketplace that, as design and engineering educators, we face, and that our students must anticipate and be themselves prepared to constructively engage.

DESIGN EDUCATION AS THE WORLD TURNS: ROUND => FLAT

Schools of engineering . . . are all centrally concerned with the process of design. Engineering schools have become schools of mathematics and physics.

Herbert A. Simon

Simon's two observations about engineering schools appear on the same page in his landmark lectures on *The Sciences of the Artificial* [8]. They reflect a view that is increasingly widely shared, namely, that engineering schools ought to focus on design as their central activity, rather than being schools of applied science, that is, applied mathematics, applied physics, and so on. The foundations of this engineering science approach to the study of engineering has been widely and frequently discussed (e.g. see [14, 15] and many of the references cited in both) and so will not be explored again here. Suffice it to say that the fundamental curriculum model inspired by the Grinter report [16] still obtains almost universally (at least in the US), but in recent years the schools of engineering that offer such curricula have been under what might be termed as a triple convergence of pressures.

The first element of the convergence is curriculum pressures that push toward reducing the number of credit hours required to complete a typical bachelor's programme. For example, over the period 1962–2002 the credit hours required at The Cooper Union and at Harvey Mudd College have declined, respectively, from 143.5 to 135 and from 138 to 128 (see Figs 2 (a, b)). This trend has been fairly common, so that engineering programmes now typically require 128 credits. Further, many institutions have long been discussing the notion of reducing the number of engineering credit hours to the same number typically required for B.A. degrees, that is, 120 hours. Of course, the reasons for these particular pressures may well vary with the institution, but there seems to be a widespread sentiment outside of engineer-

1962			2002		
1st Year	F	S	1st Year	F	S
Chemistry I, II	5.5	5.5	Chemistry I, II	3	4.5
Mathematics I, II	4	4	Mathematics I, II, III	6	4
Physics I		5	Physics I		4
English I, II	3	2	Studies in Lit. I, II	3	3
Engrng. Graphics	4.5		Engrng. Design	3	
Surveying		5	Comput. Prog. for Engrs.	2	
Physical Education	1	1			
2nd Year			2nd Year		
Mathematics III, IV	5	3	Mathematics IV, V, VI	4	3
Physics II, III	6.5	4	Physics II, III	5.5	4
Statics & Dynamics I, II	2	2	Engrng., Solid Mechanics	3	3
Civil Engrng. Problems		4.5	Materials Science	3	
Economics	3		Elect. Engrng.		3
Public Speaking	2		Engrng./Sci. Elect. I		3
Civilization I		3	Modern Society I, II	3	3
3rd Year			3rd Year		
Elect. Circuits & Machs.	3		Environ. Sysys. Engrng.	4.5	
Mechs. of Materials I, II	4	4.5	Engrng./Sci. Elect. I		3
Fluid Mechanics I	4.5		Fluids, Water Res. Engrng.	3	4.5
Structures I, II	3.5	4.5	Structures I, II	4.5	3
Thermodynamics		3	Thermodynamics	3	
Soil Mechanics		3.5	Soil Mechanics		4.5
Civilization II, III	3	3	Hum. & Soc. Sci. Elect. I, II	3	3
4th Year			4th Year		
Highway Engrng.	2		Structures III	3	
Fluid Mechanics II	3		Urban Transport. Planning	3	
Civil Engrng Design I, II	4.5	4.5	Civil Engrng. Design I, II	3	3
Civil Engrng Projects I, II	1	1	Civil Engrng Projects		2
Atom. & Nuclear Physics	3		Engrng./Sci. Elect. II, III, IV	3	6
Civilization IV	3		Hum. & Soc. Sci. Elect. III, IV	3	3
Sanitary Engrng.		3.5			
Structures III		3			
Social Philosophy		3			
TOTAL CREDITS (1962)	143.5		TOTAL CREDITS (2002)	135	

Fig. 2(a). Cooper Union's B.C.E. curricula for 1962 and 2002 [15].

1962			2002		
1st Year	F	S	1st Year	F	S
Chemistry I, II	4	4	Chemistry I, II	4	4
Mathematics I, II	4	4	Mathematics I, II	4	3
Physics I, II	4	4	Physics I, II	2	4
English I, II	3	3	Hum. & Soc. Sci. I, II	4	3
Engrng. Problems III, IV	2	2	Intro. Engrng. Design		3
			Computer Science	3	
2nd Year			2nd Year		
Chemistry III, IV	3	4	Mathematics III, IV	3	3
Mathematics III, IV	3	3	Physics III	4	
Physics III, IV	4	4	Hum. & Soc. Sci. III, IV	3	3
Humanities I, II	3	3	Biology or Free Elective	3	3
Social Sciences I, II	3	3	Intro. Engrng. Systems	3	
			Experimental. Engrng.		3
			Design Rep. & Real.		1
			Continuum Mechanics		3
3rd Year			3rd Year		
Thermodynamics	4		Chem. & Thermal Processes	3	
Elec. Engrng. I, II	4	3	Electron. & Magnet. Devices	2	
Mechanics		3	Computer Engrng.		3
Technical Electives I, II	3	3	Adv. Engrng. Systems I, II	3	3
Mathematics V, VI	3	3	Engrng. Seminar I, II	0	0
Humanities III, IV	3	3	Engrng. Clinic I		3
Social Sciences III, IV	3	3	Technical Elective I		3
			Hum. & Soc. Sci. V, VI, VII	6	3
4th Year			4th Year		
Sol. State Mol. Engrng.	3		Materials Engrng.	3	
Engrng. Lab. I, II	2	2	Engrng. Seminar III, IV	0	0
Engrng. Des. & Anal. I, II	4	4	Engrng. Clinic II, III	3	3
Technical Electives III, IV	3	3	Technical Elective II, III	3	3
Humanities V, VI	3	3	Hum. & Soc. Sci. VIII–XII	6	9
Social Sciences V, VI	3	3	Integrative Experience	3	
TOTAL CREDITS (1962)	138		TOTAL CREDITS (2002)	128	

Fig. 2(b). Harvey Mudd College's B.S.E. curricula for 1962 and 2002 [15].

ing departments that engineering is too demanding a course of study and it should be scaled back to conform to more standard college programme requirements.

Another facet of pressure on the curriculum is the increased interest in having engineers learn and improve their soft skills (which some might call professional practice skills), that is, their communication skills, both verbal and written, their ability to work in teams and their understanding of both ethics and the societal implications of their work. For example, ABET's recently-adopted Engineering Criteria 2000 reflect the importance of these soft skills. This can be seen in a listing of some of ABET's criteria for graduating engineers [17], which are also very similar to the well-known Boeing list of highly desired attributes [18]:

- criterion (c) states a goal that engineering graduates have 'an ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs,
- criterion (d) addresses the need to function on multi-disciplinary teams,
- criterion (f) addresses social and ethical responsibilities,
- criterion (g) addresses communication skills,
- criterion (h) addresses global and societal impact.

Emphasis on the ABET criteria produces pressure on the curriculum because, for most engineering faculty, making space for the skills behind these criteria means reducing the number and scope of the *hard* courses that 'everyone must take'.

Still another part of the curriculum pressures are embodied in actions such as the adoption of Policy 465 by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), which was also recently incorporated into the model law of the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) [19]. The crux of Policy 465 is a formal recognition that an undergraduate degree no longer provides sufficient depth to provide a basis for professional registration, that is, for a P.E. licence. Instead, registration requirements would be based on (1) a more general (and perhaps less demanding) undergraduate degree and (2) a master's degree in engineering or 30 additional credits of approved upper-level undergraduate courses or graduate courses. While it is likely a long time before this sentiment is formally adopted by all of the engineering schools and all of the professional societies, it is certainly one of the futures envisioned in the NAE study [11].

The second pressure in our triple convergence is that produced by perceived changes in the quality of the mathematics and computer skills of our engineering undergraduates. While it might have been a misplaced sentiment, it was also the *sine qua non* of engineering education that mathematics was the language of engineering. Thus, a major part of the first two years of the engineering curriculum is devoted to mathematics, and most of the courses

taught in the last two years are really exercises in the mathematical modelling of solids, fluids, circuits, etc. We have emphasized mathematics both as the means for setting and formulating problems, and as the means by which these problems are to be solved [14]. As a result, prospective engineering students take more advanced (AP) courses in mathematics in high school, and a high score on the mathematics SAT is viewed as a strong indicator of how well an engineering student will fare. Nowadays, on the other hand, many engineering faculty feel that our entering students do not have the mathematical skills and depth that they should, although they are widely credited with a high degree of computer literacy. (This attribute is not an unmixed blessing: far too many students nowadays equate library research with web searches and the consequent citation of web links of dubious provenance.) In addition, it has become commonplace that engineering faculty expect students to do their homework (and even their exams) on a computer. This often fosters a disconnect between the modelling of problems that is done in mathematics and the subsequent computer-based solving of those same problems. All too often, students exercise computer programs without understanding what they can (and cannot) do or the limits imposed on those very same programs by their creators. Thus, while there's no doubt that students and faculty alike widely use computers, it is less clear that students (and sometimes faculty as well) understand the underlying mathematical and physical models that their programs use, or develop the kinds of insights they need to properly interpret the numbers that their programs produce. That is, are students schooled to think about the dimensions and units of their calculations, or about the relative magnitude(s) of their results, or even about the number of significant figures that are meaningful and appropriate?

The last curriculum pressure in this triple convergence is an emerging one whose influence is as yet unclear. While it is increasingly widely understood that engineering practice has changed a lot in recent years, it is not yet clear that engineering schools have integrated this awareness into their curricula in very meaningful ways. The elements of the changes lie partly in the realm of computer practices, albeit in a different sense and at different levels from the computer issues just described above. But they also lie in the phenomenon that Friedman refers to more generally as commoditization [2], and that is in the fact that engineering tasks have also become commodities. This is due in part to the fact that many basic design and analysis tasks have become sufficiently routine that they can be automated to some degree, and so they are readily incorporated into computer programs. But it is also due to the fact that engineering talent spread around the globe is now able to work on parts or all of an engineering endeavor because of new communication capabil-

ities—especially the Internet and the world-wide web, and most notably, that talent can interact with other geographically (and temporally) dispersed engineers, managers, marketers, etc. The challenge to engineering educators is thus to reflect two changes in engineering practice: the kinds of tasks that engineers will do and the teamwork required of engineers working with other talent at sites that are no longer ‘just down the hall’.

In the face of these challenges to our accustomed traditions of engineering education, several questions emerge:

- What do we want our engineering students to learn?
- How are we going to teach it?
- Are engineering schools able and willing to change to reflect the new realities?

It is hard to know how to answer these questions and, for the moment, it seems very hard to believe that the answer to the last question is (sufficiently) positive and affirmative. It is a sad fact that engineering curricula are still:

- highly structured, serial course sequences;
- in which the early (and foundational) courses are taught by non-engineers;
- remain institutionalized in a science or reductionist model of engineering.

In fact, Fig. 2 clearly show that at two of the best-known undergraduate schools of engineering, the curricula have hardly changed since the early 1960s. There have been some changes (e.g. the introduction of courses in computer science and in biology), but the first two years of both programmes still embody the same foundational structure embodied in the recommendations of the Grinter report [16]. The preponderance of the engineering science aspect of current curricula is also still (more) evident in Fig. 2(a), wherein in a style more typical of discipline-specific curricula, the balance is clearly tipped more toward analysis (reductionism) than design (synthesis).

In terms of what schools of engineering should strive to teach, one set of ideas is expressed in the following quotes. Consistent with the observations just above about the content of current engineering curricula, McMasters [9] has suggested that ‘beyond being “theoretical carpenters” (i.e., who have a good knowledge of the physics and metallurgy of their tools, but have never themselves made anything even of wood), engineers must be able to create or synthesize systems or design’. Wulf [20] has noted that ‘engineering is both a

body of knowledge and a process’. These quotes reinforce the ideas that engineering education is much more than a list of required subjects. Rather, the engineering curriculum should be viewed as the sum of a set of experiences in which future engineers will participate and a set of skills that they will acquire as a result of those experiences [14]. Then, perhaps, engineering students will learn to think like engineers. However, since the purpose of this sixth Mudd Design Workshop is, in fact, to propose some key ideas for the future of engineering education in this flat world era, we close this part of our discussion by suggesting a few questions that workshop participants might address as the workshop unfolds. These questions include:

- What engineering tasks and jobs are buffered against Friedman’s level playing field?
- What roles should graduating engineers (and their mentors and faculty role models!) play in the face of McMaster’s perfect storm?
- What should engineering education encompass and emphasize given the forces unleashed in Dym’s triple convergence?
- What can we do to persuade our institutions to face and realistically engage all of the above?

CONCLUSIONS

. . . the engineering curriculum is an artifact, worthy of design.

Clive L. Dym after Lynn Conway and Mark Stefik

The principal conclusion we draw from or about the trends and forces described above is this, which is a modification and extension of the major conclusion of a recent comprehensive survey of design thinking [21]:

. . . the most important recommendation is that engineers in academe, both faculty members and administrators, seriously address the issues raised by globalization and by environmental changes and work to appropriately design their pedagogy in future curriculum decisions.

Acknowledgments—I am very grateful for the continuing, enthusiastic support of the MDW VI Organizing Committee: Alice M. Agogino, University of California, Berkeley; Cindy J. Atman, University of Washington; J. Edward Colgate, Northwestern University; Philip E. Doepker, University of Dayton; John S. Lamancusa, Pennsylvania State University; Larry J. Leifer, Stanford University; John H. McMasters, The Boeing Company; Gregory B. Olson, Northwestern University; John W. Prados, University of Tennessee–Knoxville; Sheri D. Shepard, Stanford University; and John W. Wesner, Carnegie Mellon University. I am particularly grateful to John McMasters for reading and vetting some early drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. T. L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York (1999).
2. T. L. Friedman, *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York (2005).

3. C. L. Dym (Editor), *Computing Futures in Engineering Design*, Proceedings of a Workshop, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 2–3 May 1997. See also C. L. Dym (Guest Editor), Special Issue, *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis, and Manufacturing*, **12**(1), 1998.
4. C. L. Dym (Editor), *Designing Design Education for the 21st Century*, Proceedings of a Workshop, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 19–21 May 1999. See also C. L. Dym and S. D. Sheppard (Guest Editors), Special Issue, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.* **17**(4, 5), 2001.
5. C. L. Dym and L. Winner (Co-Eds), *The Social Dimensions of Engineering Design*, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 17–19 May 2001. See also C. L. Dym and L. Winner (Guest Editors), Special Issue, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.* **19**(1), 2003.
6. C. L. Dym (Ed.), *Designing Engineering Education*, Proceedings of a Workshop, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 10–12 July 2003. See also C. L. Dym (Guest Editor), Special Issue, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.* **20**(3), 2004.
7. C. L. Dym (Editor), *Learning and Engineering Design*, Proceedings of a Workshop, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 19–21 May 2005. See also C. L. Dym (Guest Editor), Special Issue, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.* **22**(3), 2006.
8. H. A. Simon, *The Sciences of the Artificial*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, (1969, 1981 1994).
9. J. H. McMasters, A Paleoaerodynamicist's Reflections—A Perspective on Airplane Design and the Biomechanics of Flight, *Leonardo Times*, **10**(3), 2006, pp. 24–6?
10. The Engineer of 2020: Visions of Engineering in the New Century, National Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C. (2004).
11. *Educating the Engineer of 2020: Adapting Engineering Education to the New Century*, National Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C. (2005).
12. *Rising Above The Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*, National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2007.
13. V. Wadhwa, G. Gereffi, B. Rissing and R. Ong, Where the Engineers Are, *Issues in Science and Technology*, 2007, pp. 73–84.
14. C. L. Dym, Learning Engineering: Design, Languages, and Experiences, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **88**(2), 1999, pp. 145–148.
15. C. L. Dym, Design, Systems, and Engineering Education, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **20**(3), 2004, pp. 305–312.
16. L. E. Grinter, Report on the Evaluation of Engineering Education, *Eng. Educ.*, **46**, 1956, pp. 25–63.
17. J. W. Prados, Can ABET Really make a difference? *Int. J. Eng. Educ.* **20**(3), 2004, pp. 315–317.
18. J. H. McMasters and R. M. Cummings, Those With Imagination but Not Learning Have Wings but No Feet—Challenges for Aerospace and Engineering for the 21st Century, *The BENT of Tau Beta Pi*, 12–19, Summer 2004. [See also: <http://www.boeing.com/company/offices/pwu/attributes/attributes.html>]
19. NCEES Vote Advances Implementation of ASCE's Policy 465, *ASCE News*, **31**(10), 2006, pp. 1.
20. W. A. Wulf, Some Thoughts on Engineering as a Humanistic Discipline, Keynote Address, *Mudd Design Workshop VI: Designing Engineering Education*, Claremont, California, (2003).
21. C. L. Dym, A. M. Agogino, D. D. Frey, O. Eris and L. J. Leifer, Engineering Design Thinking, Teaching, and Learning, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **94**(1), 2005, pp. 103–120.

Clive L. Dym has been Fletcher Jones Professor of Engineering Design at Harvey Mudd College since 1991, where he directs the Center for Design Education and was also department chair (1999–2002). His interests include design theory, knowledge-based (expert) systems for engineering design, and structural and applied mechanics. He completed the B.S.C.E. at Cooper Union (1964), an MS at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute (1964) and the Ph.D. at Stanford University (1967). He has published some 85 refereed journal articles, was the Founding Editor of the *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing*, and has served on the editorial boards of several other journals, including the ASME's *Journal of Mechanical Design*. In addition to editing nine volumes, he has written eleven books, including: *Engineering Design: A Synthesis of Views*, Cambridge University Press, 1994; *Engineering Design: A Project-Based Introduction* (co-authored by P. Little), 2nd ed., John Wiley, 2004; and *Principles of Mathematical Modeling*, 2nd ed., Academic Press, 2004. Dr. Dym is a Fellow of the Acoustical Society of America, ASCE, ASME, and the ASEE. Dr. Dym's awards include the *Walter L. Huber Research Prize* (ASCE, 1980), the *Western Electric Fund Award* (ASEE, 1983), the *Boeing Outstanding Educator Award* (first runner-up, 2001), the *Fred Merryfield Design Award* (ASEE, 2002), the *Joel and Ruth Spira Outstanding Design Educator Award* (ASME, 2004), and the *Archie Higdon Distinguished Educator Award* (Mechanics Division, ASEE, 2006).

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World
List of Participants
23-25 May 2007



Alice M. Agogino

Mechanical Engineering
University of California, Berkeley
5136 Etcheverry Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-1740
Voice: (510) 642-6450
FAX: (510) 643-5599
E-mail: agogino@berkeley.edu

Jim Borgford-Parnell

Center for Engineering Learning
and Teaching
University of Washington
Box 352180
Seattle, WA 98195-2180
Voice: (206) 221-2633
FAX: (206) 221-3161
E-mail: bparnell@u.washington.edu

Aaron Altman

Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
University of Dayton
300 College Park
Dayton, OH 45469-0210
Voice: (937) 229-5353
FAX: (937) 229-4766
E-mail: aaron.altman@notes.udayton.edu

Winslow S. Burleson

Arts Media Engineering
Arizona State University
699 South Mill Avenue
Room 395
Tempe, AZ 85281
Voice: (480) 965-9253
E-mail: wburleso@exchange.asu.edu

Cindy Atman

Center for Engineering Learning
& Teaching (CELT)
University of Washington
Box 352183
Seattle, WA 98195-2180
Voice: (206) 616-2171
FAX: (206) 221-3161
E-mail: atman@engr.washington.edu

Monica Cardella

Center for the Advancement of Scholarship
on Engineering Education (CASEE)
Center for Design Research
Stanford University
424 Panama Mall
Stanford, CA 94305
Voice: (206) 617-3554
E-mail: cardella@stanford.edu

Reid Bailey

Systems & Information Engr
University of Virginia
Box 400747
Charlottesville, VA 22904
Voice: (434) 924-6352
E-mail: rrbailey@virginia.edu

Stephen H. Carr

Undergraduate Engineering
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-7379
FAX: (847) 491-5341
E-mail: s-carr@northwestern.edu



Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World List of Participants 23-25 May 2007

Tamara Christensen

College of Design
Arizona State University
2307 N. 51st Place
Phoenix, AZ 85008
Voice: (480) 262-6665
E-mail: Tamara.Christensen@asu.edu

J. Edward Colgate

Mechanical Engineering
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-4264
E-mail: colgate@northwestern.edu

Philip Doepker

Mechanical Engineering
University of Dayton
300 College Park Drive
Dayton, OH 45469
Voice: (937) 229-2971
FAX: (937) 229-4922
E-mail: doepker@udayton.edu

Ziyad Durón

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 607-3883
FAX: (909) 621-8967
E-mail: ziyad_duran@hmc.edu

Clive L. Dym

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 621-8853
FAX: (909) 621-8967
E-mail: clive_dym@hmc.edu

Richard Goff

Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall
Mail Code 0218
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Voice: (540) 231-9537
FAX: (540) 231-6903
E-mail: richgoff@vt.edu

Eduardo González M.

CIDYT
ITESM
Av. Eugenio Garza Sada
#2501 Sur Col. Tecnológico
Monterrey, N.L. Mexico
Voice: +52 (81) 8358-2000 Ext. 5351
FAX: +52 (81) 8328-4123
E-mail: egm@itesm.mx

Daniel L. Goroff

Academic Affairs
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 621-8122
E-mail: Daniel_Goroff@hmc.edu

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World
List of Participants
23-25 May 2007



Bhavna Hariharan

Mechanical Engineering
Stanford University
214 Pine Hill Ct, Apt. 105
Stanford, CA 94305
Voice: (650) 353-1153
FAX: (650) 725-8546
E-mail: bhavna.h@gmail.com

Yan Jin

Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
University of Southern California
3650 McClintock Avenue
OHE 430
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1453
Voice: (213) 740-9574
E-mail: YJIN@usc.edu

Mark Henderson

Engineering
Arizona State University
110 CNTR Bldg.
7001 East Williams Field Road
Mesa, AZ 85212
Voice: (480) 727-1062
FAX: (480) 727-1778
E-mail: mark.henderson@asu.edu

Maria Klawe

President
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 621-8120
E-mail: Maria_Klawe@hmc.edu

Jonathan Hey

Mechanical Engineering
University of California, Berkeley
6102 Etcheverry Hall
Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94720
Voice: (510) 499-2628
E-mail: jono@berkeley.edu

Gül Kremer

Engineering Design Program
The Pennsylvania State University
213 T Hammond Building
University Park, PA 16803
Voice: (814) 863-1530
FAX: (814) 863-7229
E-mail: gkremer@psu.edu

Penny L. Hirsch

The Writing Program
Northwestern University
1860 Campus Drive, 2-178
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-7414
FAX: (847) 491-4840
E-mail: phirsch@northwestern.edu

John S. Lamancusa

Mechanical Engineering
The Pennsylvania State University
314 Leonhard Building
University Park, PA 16802
Voice: (814) 863-3350
FAX: (814) 865-9693
E-mail: jsl3@psu.edu



Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World List of Participants 23-25 May 2007

Nancy Lape

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 607-3886
FAX: (909) 621-8967
E-mail: lape@hmc.edu

Larry J. Leifer

Mechanical Engineering - Design
Stanford University
TERMAN 507
Stanford, CA 94305-4021
Voice: (650) 723-1869
FAX: (650) 723-3521
E-mail: leifer@cdr.stanford.edu

Patrick Little

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 607-1712
FAX: (909) 621-8967
E-mail: Patrick_Little@hmc.edu

Christopher L. Magee

Mechanical Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue, NE20-392
Cambridge, MA 02142
Voice: (617) 252-1077
E-mail: cmagee@mit.edu

Michele Manuel

Materials Science and Engineering
Northwestern University
11213 William McCool Street
El Paso, TX 79934
Voice: (352) 682-3701
E-mail: m-manuel@northwestern.edu

Ann McKenna

IDEA
Northwestern University
2133 Sheridan Road, G319
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-6761
FAX: (847) 491-2603
E-mail: mckenna@northwestern.edu

John H. McMasters

The Boeing Company
P. O. Box 3707
M/C 6Y-93
Seattle, WA 98124-2207
Voice: (425) 965-4312
FAX: (425) 965-4311
E-mail: john.h.mcmasters@boeing.com

Lisa D. McNair

Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall (0218)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: (540) 231-1144
FAX: (540) 231-6903
E-mail: lmcnair@vt.edu

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World
List of Participants
23-25 May 2007



Matthew M. Mehalik
Industrial Engineering
University of Pittsburgh
BENDM 1048 Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
Voice: (412) 624-7245
E-mail: mmehalik@pitt.edu

Marie C. Paretti
Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall (0218)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: (540) 231-7520
FAX: (540) 231-6903
E-mail: mparetti@vt.edu

Jennifer Mullin
Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: (540) 231-6555
FAX: (540) 231-6903
E-mail: jsmullin@vt.edu

Parviz Payvar
Mechanical Engineering
Northern Illinois University
1425 West Lincoln Highway
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice: (815) 753-3346
FAX: (815) 753-0416
E-mail: payvar@ceet.niu.edu

Dave Ollis
Chemical Engineering
North Carolina State University
Box 7905
Raleigh, NC 27695-7905
Voice: (919) 515-2329
FAX: (919) 515-3465
E-mail: ollis@eos.ncsu.edu

John W. Prados
Chemical Engineering
The University of Tennessee
1512 Middle Drive
Knoxville, TN 37996-2200
Voice: (865) 974-6053
FAX: (865) 974-7076
E-mail: jprados@utk.edu

Greg Olson
Materials Science & Engineering
Northwestern University
2220 Campus Drive, Suite 2021
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-2847
FAX: (847) 491-7820
E-mail: g-olson@northwestern.edu

Dale M. Ramezani
The Boeing Company
2600 Westminister Boulevard
P.O. Box 3644 MC 110-SD52
Seal Beach, CA 90740-7644
Voice: (562) 889-1173
E-mail: dale.m.ramezani@boeing.com



Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World List of Participants 23-25 May 2007

Bernard Roth

Mechanical Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-4021
Voice: (650) 723-3657
FAX: (650) 723-3521
E-mail: broth@stanford.edu

Dirk Schaefer

George W. Woodruff School of ME
Georgia Tech Savannah
210 Technology Circle
Savannah, GA 31407
Voice: (912) 966-7946
FAX: (912) 966-7928
E-mail: dirk.schaefer@me.gatech.edu

Christopher J. Scolese

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
NASA Headquarters
300 E Street SW
Washington, DC 20546-0001
Voice: (202) 358-1823
E-mail: cscolese@nasa.gov

Sheri D. Sheppard

Mechanical Engineering
Stanford University
503 Terman
Stanford, CA 94305
Voice: (650) 723-4287
FAX: (650) 723-3521
E-mail: sheppard@stanford.edu

Frank Skinner

Mechanical Engineering and
Engineering Science
The University of North Carolina
at Charlotte
9201 University City Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
Voice: (704) 687-8212
E-mail: fskinner@uncc.edu

Philipp L. Skogstad

Mechanical Engineering
Stanford University
525 Cleveland Street
Redwood City, CA 94062
Voice: (650) 961-1345
E-mail: skogstad@stanford.edu

Janis Terpenny

Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall
Mail Code 0218
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Voice: (540) 231-9538
FAX: (540) 231-6903
E-mail: terpenny@vt.edu

Henri Thevenot

Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering
The Pennsylvania State University
310 Leonhard Building
University Park, PA 16802
Voice: (814) 880-9492
FAX: (814) 863-4745
E-mail: HENRI@PSU.EDU

Design and Engineering Education in a Flat World
List of Participants
23-25 May 2007



David G. Ullman

Robust Decisions Inc.
1655 NW Hillcrest Drive
Corvallis, OR 97330
Voice: (541) 754-3609
E-mail: ullman@robustdecisions.com

Michael Wald

Editor, International Journal of
Engineering Education
Rossmore
Durrus
County Cork
Ireland
Voice: +3532761400
FAX: +3532762895
E-mail: ijee@eircom.net

John W. Wesner

Mechanical Engineering
Carnegie Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Voice: (412) 268-2507
FAX: (412) 268-5229
E-mail: jwesner@andrew.cmu.edu

Maria Yang

Industrial and Systems Engineering
University of Southern California
3715 McClintock Avenue, GER201
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Voice: (213) 740-3543
FAX: (213) 740-1120
E-mail: maria.yang@usc.edu

Yang Zhang

Psychology Department
The Pennsylvania State University
429 Moore Building
University Park, PA 16801
Voice: (814) 237-4490
E-mail: yzz107@psu.edu