

MUDD DESIGN WORKSHOP V

LEARNING AND ENGINEERING DESIGN

Proceedings of a Workshop

19-21 May 2005

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

M. S. Wald	419	Editorial
C. L. Dym	420–421	Guest Editorial
C. L. Dym	422–428	Engineering Design: So Much to Learn
S. Sheppard, A. Colby, K. Macatangay and W. Sullivan	429–438	What is Engineering Practice?
D. C. Davis, S. W. Beyerlein and I. T. Davis	439–446	Deriving Design Course Learning Outcomes from a Professional Profile
J. H. McMasters	447–459	Influencing Student Learning: An Industry Perspective
L. R. Lattuca, L. C. Strauss and J. F. Volkwein	460–469	Getting in Sync: Faculty and Employer Perceptions from the National Study of EC2000
M. Contero, F. Naya, P. Company and J. L. Saorin	470–477	Learning Support Tools for Developing Spatial Abilities in Engineering Design
C. L. Magee and D. D. Frey	478–488	Experimentation and its Role in Engineering Design: Linking a Student Design Exercise to New Results from Cognitive Psychology
Y. Reich, E. Kolberg and I. Levin	489–495	Designing Contexts for Learning Design
G. E. Okudan and S. Mohammed	496–502	Facilitating Design Learning in a Cooperative Environment: Findings on Team Functioning
T. Meijknecht and H. Van Drongelen	503–507	The Five Saints of Electrical Engineering
R. Bailey and Z. Szabo	508–518	Assessing Engineering Design Process Knowledge
M. Mehalik and C. Schunn	519–532	What Constitutes Good Design? A Review of Empirical Studies of Design Processes
D. K. Sobek, II	533–539	System-Level Design: A Missing Link?
D. Socha and S. Walter	540–550	Is Designing Software Different From Designing Other Things?
O. Eris	551–559	Insisting on Truth at the Expense of Conceptualization: Can Engineering Portfolios Help?
K. J. Obarski and S. W. Soled	560–565	Engineers as Inquiry Practitioners
M. Ogot and G. E. Okudan	566–576	Systematic Creativity Methods in Engineering Education: A Learning Styles Perspective
M. W. Ohland and J. D. Summers	577–583	Teaching Design Using Multiple Hierarchical Engineering Education Models
T. Healy	584–590	Restructuring an Engineering Core Course to Prepare Students for Design Experiences
C. Lewis, S. Magleby and R. Todd	591–597	Learning to Design Products in Environments with Limited Design Traditions
J. Turns, M. Cardella, C. J. Atman, J. Martin, J. Newman and R. S. Adams	598–608	Tackling the Research-to-Teaching Challenge in Engineering Design Education: Making the Invisible Visible
J. P. Terpenney, R. M. Goff, M. R. Vernon and W. R. Green	609–616	Utilizing Assistive Technology Design Projects and Interdisciplinary Teams to Foster Inquiry and Learning in Engineering Design
A. Agogino, S. Song and J. Hey	617–625	Triangulation of Indicators of Successful Student Design Teams
E. Cuddihy and J. Turns	626–636	Assessing One Aspect of Design Learning: Qualitative Analysis of Students' Design Rationales
S. Finger, D. Gelman, A. Fay and M. Szczerban	637–644	Assessing Collaborative Learning in Engineering Design
J. M. T. Walker, D. S. Cordray, P. H. King and S. P. Brophy	645–651	Design Scenarios as an Assessment of Adaptive Expertise
J. S. Lamancusa	652–658	Design as the Bridge Between Theory and Practice
L. C. Schmidt	659–664	Engineering Teams: Individual or Group Sport?
D. Ollis and J. Krupczak	665–670	Teaching Technology Literacy: An Opportunity for Design Faculty?
A. F. McKenna, J. E. Colgate, S. H. Carr and G. B. Olson	671–678	IDEA: Formalizing the Foundation for an Engineering Design Education
P. K. Hansen, J. O. Riis, F. Gertsen and P. Israelsen	679–684	Learning for Life—PBL in Continuing Education
J. W. Wesner	685–688	What We Have Learned in Mudd Design Workshop V: Learning and Engineering Design

Editorial

This bumper issue is the biggest we have produced as yet. It brings together the eminently readable contributions from the Harvey Mudd workshop V. The series of papers from the workshops have been published in Volumes 17, 19, 20 and 21 of this journal and represent a milestone collection of papers on engineering design education and the wider issues of engineering education. Contributions also contain features on creativity (Ogot et.al.) and spirituality (Meijknecht et al.) and pointedly reveal the increasing involvement of social and education faculty with engineering education issues. It is a manifestation of the concern of all educators with issues of social responsibility and sustainability—concerns now common to anyone committed to the future of the planet. Clive Dym has been the guiding spirit of these meetings and has carefully and judiciously selected and reviewed the contributions. My deep appreciation and thanks to Clive.

The journal Website has added a feature of great importance for referencing IJEE publications. A search engine for the journal site is now available. It reveals the wealth of information contained in the journal's papers. The search engine is still under development towards full potential of searching all contents of individual articles, but is already quite powerful in searching contents. The reason for it not yet working at full power is that our files as printed are not searchable in PDF. We are actively pursuing conversion of all files to searchable PDF so that all data can be searched.

Once again, a consideration of the current exceptionally large number of contributions the journal is receiving implies a singularly phenomenal rejection rate. The journal, receiving over 1000 contributions a year and having increases in numbers of published papers to over 150 papers a year as compared to 50 papers 5 years ago. We are pleased with the rate of submission—ensuring a high quality of the accepted publications. Inevitably though, there are quite a number of good contributions we are unable to accommodate for publication.

Michael Wald

Guest Editorial

The papers in this special issue of the *International Journal of Engineering Education* represent much of the proceedings of Mudd Design Workshop V, “Learning and Engineering Design,” that was held on the campus of Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, California, during 19–21 July 2005. Supported by The Boeing Company and Harvey Mudd College’s Department of Engineering, this workshop brought together engineers and social scientists over three very busy days to discuss what is known about 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 various goals that they would try to advance—both individually and collectively. These are summarized in John W. Wesner’s wrap-up paper (below).

At MDW V’s 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. The 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?”, Pellegrino 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. Pellegrino 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! An abstract of Pellegrino’s talk is contained herein.

The MDW V audience was 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 the Workshop’s 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.” Lamancusa’s paper and that of Chaplains Meijknecht and von Drongelen also follow below.

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 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’ position papers. Clearly, these papers represent a rich body of experience and knowledge that, I hope, can be brought to bear in support of education revision and reform with the same intelligence and vigor that the participants brought to MDW V. (Further details about the MDW V and its organization can be found on a CD that is available through the Department of Engineering at Harvey Mudd: Clive L. Dym (Editor), *Mudd Design Workshop V: Learning and Engineering Design*, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA 91711.)

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 still 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. Anthony 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: Sue for a design that clearly maintains "the MDW look and feel" for the Proceedings CD, and the Center for Design Education (CDE) web site; Cathy for providing both editorial and logistical assistance; and Dan and Sue for making the MDW V trains run on time. Thanks as well to Cynthia Wheeler for ensuring that MDW V vendors were paid and that all of accounts balanced. Brian Kirkpatrick (HMC '07) also deserves thanks for implementing Sue's design, building the Proceedings CD, and getting it out. 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
Department of Engineering
Harvey Mudd College

Engineering Design: So Much to Learn*

CLIVE L. DYM

Department of Engineering, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 91711–5990, USA.

E-mail: clive_dym@hmc.edu.

This paper recaptures remarks made at the opening of a workshop on learning and engineering design by the workshop's organizing committee's chair. Held at Harvey Mudd College in May 2005, and supported by Mudd's Center for Design Education, Mudd Design Workshop V brought together engineers and social scientists—in their roles as educators, researchers, and practitioners interested in learning and in design—to identify and articulate important issues about learning in engineering design. The remarks detailed below are intended to provide a context for the presentations and discussions that comprised the workshop by exploring some of the many difficulties attendant to teaching design. While this address may have been preaching to the choir, it is nonetheless somewhat unsettling to list the myriad of skills associated with good design. In addition, the point is made that while the difficulties of teaching design may still be under-appreciated by the (much) larger analysis community, the benefits associated with teaching design are increasingly seen as the primary goals of engineering education—which suggests that in the long run, design and synthesis will at least draw equal to, if not prevail over analysis and reductionism as the prime movers in engineering education.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO DESIGN, TO LEARN, TO KNOW?

AS HAS BEEN DONE before (e.g., [1]), this fifth Mudd Design Workshop (MDW V) was designed to stretch the reach of prior workshops [2–4] to include both ideas and colleagues from other domains with an interest in learning—alongside those interested ‘only’ in engineering design—in its Organizing Committee, its presentations, and its audience. Now the phrase *engineering design* is one that takes on a wider variety of meanings depending on both context and interlocutor, as has been extensively detailed in [5], and from which work this paper derives much of its inspiration and content. In fact, the definition of design adopted in [5] articulated the idea that engineering design is a *thought* process that depends on the systematic, intelligent generation of design concepts, as well as of the specifications that make it possible to manufacture or realize these concepts.

Engineering design is a systematic, intelligent process in which designers generate, evaluate, and specify concepts for devices, systems, or processes whose form and function achieve clients' objectives or users' needs while satisfying a specified set of constraints.

This definition also recognizes that designers typically have a client (or customer) who, in turn, has in mind a set of users (or customers) for whose benefit the designed artifact is being developed. And while this formal definition stands design educators, researchers, and practitioners in good

stead, it does not capture the flavor of views about design thinking that will be addressed in the next section.

The verb *learn* may also mean different things to different people, and even different things to the same person at different times or in different contexts. Rather than propose new definitions, this discussion begins with a review of the meaning of the verb *learn* as given in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* [6]:

learn (*vb*): to gain knowledge or understanding of or skill in by study, instruction, or experience

Note that this definition places essentially complete responsibility on the learner, as it is she or he who must *gain* the knowledge, whether by personal contemplation, being taught, or engaging in the very activity being learned. Since this definition also suggests a direct link from learning to knowing, it seems also useful to look up what it means to *know* [6]:

know (*vb*): to perceive directly; have direct cognition of

syn: know, believe, think, to hold something in one's mind as being true or being what's purported to be true

Clearly, *know* has several synonyms and there are likely endless debates one might have about whether *knowing* something is the same as *believing* something, and so on, and there are clearly domains whether such distinctions could really matter—for example, think of theology. Since the only aim here is to set a stage for the vigorous intellectual discussion of which this workshop will be comprised, the fine distinctions hinted at here are eschewed.

* Accepted 21 January 2006.

Finally, perhaps as an act of self-defense, one further definition is listed, this one taken from an entirely different context [7]:

Synthesis, by definition, leaves out, collapses, and generalizes.

Thus, if the author has erred in synthesizing the work of his colleagues [5], remember that he is only collapsing and generalizing!

THE SKILLS OF DESIGN THINKING

Sheppard [8] observed that engineers ‘scope, generate, evaluate and realize ideas’—a characterization that emphasizes how engineers *think* and highlights how ideas are *created* (i.e., scope and generate), *assessed and selected* (i.e., evaluated), and *brought to life* (i.e., realized). It has also been noted that *analysis* cannot by itself adequately account for the mental processes that lead to successful *synthesis* or *design* [9]. Experience both in the real world and in the classroom tends to confirm this proposition, and few would disagree that analysis is easier to teach than design. Why is design—no doubt a fascinating and complex human endeavor—so hard to learn and so hard to teach?

The answer is (relatively) simple. As will be outlined immediately below, design thinking requires a broad spectrum of talents and approaches in which analysis may play an essential supporting role, but in which various kinds of judgment, reflection, and experience are far more essential to the design task at hand. On the other hand, most of the content taught in today’s engineering curricula is associated with mathematics and the sciences, wherein students are required to learn and apply scientific principles to solve engineering problems, using *systematic questioning* to analyze constrained situations to reach verifiable (i.e., ‘truthful’) answers or solutions [10]. While systematic questioning describes *analysis* well, it does not apply straightforwardly in a *design* context, in spite of the fact that design educators already argue that the tools and techniques used to support designers are [11] ‘. . . ways of asking questions, and presenting and viewing the answers to those questions as the design process unfolds’. And while accepted models of the design process (see, for example, Figure 2.4 of [11]) show iterative loops between various stages of design, it is a different kind of questioning that takes place during the design process [10].

Dym, et al. [5], argued extensively that good designers generally exhibit several attributes in their *design thinking*. Thus, designers:

- view design as *inquiry*, or as an iterative loop of divergent-convergent thinking, and thus are able to *tolerate (intellectual) ambiguity*;
- maintain awareness of the *big picture* because they are sensitive to system component interactions and to the design of systems;

- do not assume the world is fully deterministic, and so they are able to *accommodate uncertainty*;
- able to *make decisions*;
- are conversant with and can both *think and communicate in the several languages of design*;
- are able to view design as a social process and *can work successfully as members of design teams*.

A HANDLING AMBIGUITY

Any design project begins with questioning during the *problem definition* phase of the process [11]. Once a series of objectives for a designed artifact has been set out, the designers—both in ‘real’ and class design studios—work to know what the client really wants. What is a safe product? What does ‘cheap’ mean? What is the best . . . ? Questioning is clearly an integral part of design.

Aristotle [12] proposed that ‘the kinds of questions we ask are as many as the kinds of things which we know.’ In other words, *knowledge resides in the questions that can be asked and the answers that can be provided* [5]. The nature of systematic questioning in a design context has been studied and it does seem that designers’ inquiry and thinking processes might have unique, identifiable characteristics [10].

A common premise of such discussions is that specific answers or sets of answers exist for given questions, a characteristic of *convergent thinking*, where the questioner attempts to converge on and reveal ‘facts’. Answers to converging questions are expected to be verifiable, to hold *truth-value*. In design questions asked for which there are multiple alternative known answers, whether true or false, and multiple unknown possible answers. The questioner wants to expose alternative known answers and *generate* possible unknown answers. Such questions characterize *divergent thinking* which attempt to diverge from facts to the *possibilities* that might be created from them. Eris [10] identified such questions as *generative design questions*, noting that questioners may not be concerned with verifiability (i.e., truthfulness) of the potential answers.

The key distinction between the two classes is that *convergent questions operate in the knowledge domain*, whereas *divergent questions operate in the concept domain*. In this context, *design thinking is seen as a series of continuous transformations from the concept domain to the knowledge domain*. Such questioning and thinking also reflects the process by which designers add to the store of engineering knowledge [13].

Finally on this point, it might be noted that engineering curricula effectively convey Aristotelian convergent inquiry that promotes the *reductionist* reasoning associated with the engineering science model. In the design or *synthesis* model, divergent inquiry takes place in the concept

domain—in which answers are not necessarily verifiable—which situation often seems to conflict with the values that are central to the predominantly deterministic, engineering science approach.

Maintaining a systems perspective

In recent decades engineering designers are making increasingly complex products and systems with evermore components and interdependencies [14] and with expanded design boundaries that include environmental and social impacts in their designed systems [15]. Engineers and designers thus need to cope with complexity, in response to which specialized programs for system design, systems engineering, and closely related areas have emerged [16]. The *system design* and *systems thinking* skills that good designers exhibit and which engineering students should experience include recognizing the systems context, reasoning about uncertainty, making estimates, and performing experiments—all of which might be thought of as desirable *habits of mind* for designers.

- *Understanding systems dynamics*: Good system designers anticipate unintended consequences that emerge from interactions among the multiple parts of a system. Unfortunately, this skill is not common and can be difficult to learn, as a result of which some have proposed a research agenda intended to enhance the scientific understanding of systems thinking and to better develop educational experiences that can efficiently improve reasoning about system dynamics [17].
- *Reasoning about uncertainty*: Designers frequently work with imperfect models, incomplete information, and sometimes with ambiguous objectives, the effects of which uncertainties are even more prominent in systems design. Some have argued that undergraduate engineering curricula do not sufficiently emphasize the roles of probability and statistics in engineering (e.g., [18]), and many studies in cognitive psychology have shown that people are prone to serious errors in probabilistic or statistical thinking, including neglecting prior probabilities, being insensitive to sample size, and not understanding regression [19]. Engineering educators have worked to overcome these difficulties by emphasizing conceptual understanding, using more hands-on teaching methods, and more graphics and simulations, but Wood argues persuasively that there is much further to go, and that uncertainty should be made central to design education [20].
- *Making estimates*: During systems design, the system often exceeds a designers' capability to grasp all of the details simultaneously because of a growing number of variables and interactions. One human strategy for keeping a system manageable is to limit the number of factors considered—and preferably the most important ones. Good designers are typically good at

such estimation, that is, they can generally determine the relative magnitudes of various parameters and identify those that can safely be ignored (for certain situations). Sadly, engineering graduates are generally not good at estimation, perhaps because engineering education often emphasizes computer-based methods for precise calculation at the expense of modeling and approximation skills.

- *Conducting experiments*: In most cases, system design requires some use of empirical data and experimentation, in addition to applying fundamental scientific principles. This circumstance is driving a trend to teach engineers in their education and in industry about the *design of experiments*, so that they can plan experiments and properly analyze the results. However, the statistical methods of experiment design alone will not by themselves enable engineers to learn effectively through experimentation. In fact, Box and Liu [21] argue that overly rigid adherence to statistical measures of optimal design will have a deleterious effect on the learning process, and that engineers must also learn to alternate between inductive processes and deductive processes, using physical understanding or engineering models to inform the experimental approach and then updating their models and their understanding based on measured data.

Making design decisions

Several decision-centric design tools and frameworks have been developed in recent years [22–28], with a common underlying premise for these *decision-based design* frameworks that design is a rational process of choosing among design alternatives. In addition, some decision-centric views [23] use a deterministic, optimization-based model to account for ambiguity. Radford and Gero also argued that exploring the relationship between design decisions and the performance of the resulting solutions is fundamental to design, with goal-seeking introduced directly into design exploration through optimization [23]. Dieter showed the relevance to design of decision-centric by constructing a decision matrix to determine the intrinsic worth of outcomes associated with competing design concepts [24], using methodology that is similar to the widely used 'Pugh selection chart' methodology [25–28].

The role of decision making in design—and, particularly, the identification of design *as* decision making—has not been without critics [29]. However, it is hard to imagine a designer who is not focused on the outcome of design decisions being made [30]. In addition, decision-based approaches to design assume that designers only make critical decisions *after* design concepts and alternatives—different choices, with different outcomes—have been generated, and that generated alternatives can be represented in forms to which decision-based design can be applied. But

decision-based design cannot suggest *how* concepts and alternatives are generated, which is often regarded as the most creative aspect of design thinking. Some decision theorists also acknowledge these limitations by recognizing that decision analysis can only be practiced after a certain point. Howard asked [31], ‘Is decision analysis too narrow for the richness of the human decision?’ He then argued that ‘framing’ and ‘creating alternatives’ should be addressed *before* decision analysis techniques are applied, observing also that ‘Framing is the most difficult part of the decision analysis process; it seems to require an understanding that is uniquely human. Framing poses the greatest challenge to the automation of decision analysis.’

The languages of engineering design

Different languages are employed to represent engineering and design knowledge at different times, and the same knowledge is often cast into different forms or languages in order to serve different purposes. Design requires the use of several languages in addition to mathematics, as do many other types of human cognition. Design knowledge includes knowledge of design procedures, shortcuts, and so on, as well as about designed objects and their attributes. Designers think about design processes when they *begin* to sketch and draw the objects they are designing. A complete representation of designed *objects* and their attributes requires a complete representation of design *concepts*—e.g., design intentions, plans, behavior, and so on—that are harder to describe or represent than are physical objects.

Several languages or representations are used in design [5, 32]:

- *verbal* or *textual statements* are used to articulate design projects, describe objects, describe constraints or limitations, communicate between different members of design and manufacturing teams, and document completed designs;
- *graphical representations* provide pictorial descriptions of designed artifacts such as sketches, renderings, and engineering drawings;
- *shape grammars* provide formal rules of syntax for combining simpler shapes into more complex shapes;
- *features* enable the aggregation and specialization of specified geometrical shapes that are often identified with specific functions;
- *mathematical* or *analytical models* express some aspect of an artifact’s function or behavior, which is often derived from *physical* principle(s);
- *numbers* represent discrete-valued design information (e.g., part dimensions) and parameters in design calculations or within algorithms representing a mathematical model.

Designers not only think in several languages; they also communicate with design team members and other stakeholders in these various languages. This in turn enables the study of design languages in the

interactions of design teams in academic, research and industrial settings. Thus, researchers have studied:

- *the roles of textual language* in the work of design teams by relating design creativity to the number of noun phrases generated by design teams during conceptual design [33];
- *computational text analysis* as a means for characterizing the performance of engineering design teams and complementing the psychometric techniques that rely on surveys and interviews [34–38];
- *cyclical semantic coherence* of student design teams that supported the hypothesis that high-performing design teams cycle between divergent and convergent patterns of thinking and questioning [39];
- *sketching activities of the individual experience* of the design process [40], and supporting analysis, short-term memory, communication, and documentation [41];
- *sketches in group settings* that showed varying patterns of sketching behavior over the design process, as well as statistically significant correlations between sketching metrics and product and process outcome measures, including the assessment of variety as a measure of the explored solution space during the idea generation process [42, 43].

Design thinking in a team environment

Constructivist theories of learning recognize that learning is a social activity [44], and both cornerstone and capstone project-based courses are seen as opportunities to improve students’ ability to work in teams, as well as their communication skills [45–49]. In addition, early researchers in design have long emphasized that the early stages of the design process are ‘inherently argumentative’, requiring the designer to continually raise questions of and argue with others over the advantages and disadvantages of alternative responses [50]. Similarly, Bucciarelli [51] defined ‘design as a social process’ in which teams define and negotiate decisions, and Minneman [52] reinforced Bucciarelli’s view that ambiguity and negotiation are inherent to design constituting a condition and a mechanism for understanding and structuring design activity.

Researchers have also looked at the role that gender plays in design education and in design teams (e.g., [53]), and at the impact of diversity on team performance considered six diversity factors: gender, ethnicity, years of experience, technical discipline, Myers-Briggs type, and distance from campus [54]. There is also a wide body of research in design practice and in design learning on the use of psychometric measurements of personality type, such as the Myers-Briggs Temperament Indicator (MBTI), to analyze and predict the behavior and likelihood of success of teams [55, 56], and these techniques have been successfully applied to form-

ing design teams in engineering classes [57, 58]. These investigations into team behaviors are detailed more extensively in [5].

Design is also a good context for ethics and for assessing societal impacts

The ABET general engineering criteria target the social aspects of engineering education at several levels [59]:

- criterion (c): ‘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): social and ethical responsibilities
- criterion (g): communication skills
- criterion (h): addresses global and societal impact

The previous discussion in this section—as well as its more detailed source [5]—make clear how many of these social goals and aspects are reached with the aid of design courses. It is worth noting briefly that design courses have been seen as a very viable context in which to elaborate both ethical issues in engineering practice in part because of the choice of projects [10, 60], and in part because of the logical similarities of the constructs of, on the one hand, mediating and choosing among different design goals, and on the other hand, mediating among conflicting obligations to the many stakeholders in the design process [61, 62].

CONCLUSIONS

A single workshop devoted to learning and engineering design will never answer, for all time, in all places, all of the questions (implicitly) raised above—and this is not because there is a shortage of talent and accomplishment in the MDW V audience. Rather, it reflects instead the persistent difficulty of these questions and of all of the underlying contexts. It is my hope that all educators, whether engineers, scientists, social scientists, or humanists, jointly recognize that the contexts for the social dimensions of engineering design are, in fact, *shared* social contexts. Further, I hope that we work together to define and explore the social contexts of engineering design education and practice, and that our dialogues will be characterized not by finger-pointing, but by careful intellectual inquiry.

The extended paper [5] from which these remarks were adapted and synthesized did discuss one major model of design pedagogy, project-based learning, as applied in two different contexts, and in several course variations. The research available on this pedagogy suggests that these kinds of courses appear to improve retention, student satisfaction, diversity, and student learning.

On the other hand, it seems evident that the elements of these kinds of courses will raise educational costs (e.g., smaller sections, involvement of senior faculty). On a macro or global scale, these costs are likely small compared to the cost of lost human talent in the engineering pipeline—yet no one has (yet) done the economic research needed to support or negate this assessment. As noted in [5], this is a very serious problem that demands much more attention from engineering department heads and engineering deans. There is a clear need to expand the number of faculty members interested in and capable of teaching design, as there is to create the facilities—such as design studios and associated shops—that are needed for modern, project-based design courses. Thus, *‘the most important recommendation is that engineers in academe, both faculty members and administrators, make enhanced design pedagogy their highest priority in future resource allocation decisions.’*

However, in the longstanding academic battle between engineering scientists and analysts, on the one side, and design and synthesis researchers and educators on the other side, perhaps it can be said that those who synthesize are catching up—and may even prevail over—the reductionists, as evidenced by the ABET goals adopted in EC 2000 and listed above. The comparison with the ‘old’ ABET approaches could not be more stark, and so perhaps the virtues of synthesis may one day prove ascendant.

Acknowledgments—I want very much to acknowledge Alice M. Agogino, Daniel D. Frey, Ozgur Eris, and Larry J. Leifer for collaborating with me on a survey article (see Ref. [5] below) for the ASEE’s *Journal of Engineering Education* and thus stimulating much of what has been said above. I am also grateful for the continuing support of the members of Workshop V’s Organizing Committee: Alice M. Agogino, University of California, Berkeley; Cindy J. Atman, University of Washington; Philip E. Doepker, University of Dayton; 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. Sheppard, Stanford University; and John W. Wesner, Carnegie Mellon University.

REFERENCES

1. C. L. Dym and L. Winner (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.
2. C. L. Dym (ed.), *Computing Futures in Engineering Design*, *Proc. 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), January 1998.

3. C. L. Dym (ed.), Designing Design Education for the 21st Century, *Proc. 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.
4. C. L. Dym (ed.), Designing Engineering Education, *Proc. 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.
5. 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), January 2005, pp. 103–120.
6. H. B. Woolf, *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, G. & C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts (1977).
7. H. R. Diner, *The Jews of the United States, 1654–2000*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California (2004).
8. S. D. Sheppard, A description of engineering: an essential backdrop for interpreting engineering education, *Proc. (CD), Mudd Design Workshop IV*, Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, California, 2003.
9. G. Pahl, How and why collaboration with cognitive psychologists began, *Designers: The Key to Successful Product Development*, Darmstadt Symposium, Darmstadt, Germany (1997).
10. O. Eris, *Effective Inquiry for Innovative Engineering Design*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts (2004).
11. C. L. Dym and P. Little, *Engineering Design: A Project-Based Introduction*, 2nd Edn, John Wiley & Sons, New York (2004).
12. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, J. Barnes (Translator), 2nd Edn, Oxford University Press, New York (1994).
13. W. G. Vinventi, *What Engineers Know and How They Know It: Analytical Studies from Aeronautical History*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland (1990).
14. D. Reynolds, J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle, Design Degrees of Freedom and Mechanisms for Complexity, *Physical Review E*, **66**, 2002 (016108) pp. 1–18.
15. D. Hastings, The future of engineering systems: development of engineering leaders, *Engineering Systems Symposium*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2004. <http://esd.mit.edu/symposium/pdfs/monograph/future.pdf>
16. C. Ng, Findings from a web based survey of degree programs in engineering systems, *Engineering Systems Symposium*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2004. esd.mit.edu/symposium/pdfs/papers/ng.pdf
17. J. K. Doyle, The cognitive psychology of systems thinking, *System Dynamics Review*, **13**(3), 1997, pp. 253–265.
18. G. A. Hazelrigg, Rethinking the curriculum: is today's engineering education irrelevant, incomplete, and incorrect? *ASME Prism*, December 1994.
19. D. Kahnemann, D. P. Slovic and A. Tversky, *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (1982).
20. W. H. Wood, Decision-based design: a vehicle for curriculum integration, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **20**(3), 2004, pp. 433–439.
21. G. E. P. Box and P. T. Y. Liu, Statistics as a catalyst to learning by scientific method, *J. Quality Technology*, **31**(1), 1999, pp. 1–29.
22. G. A. Hazelrigg, An axiomatic framework for engineering design, *J. Mech. Design*, **121**, 1999, pp. 342–347.
23. A. D. Radford and J. S. Gero, Multicriteria Optimization in architectural design, in J. S. Gero (ed.), *Design Optimization*, Academic Press, Orlando, Florida (1985).
24. G. E. Dieter, *Engineering Design: A Materials and Process Approach*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1983).
25. S. Pugh, *Total Design: Integrated Methods for Successful Product Engineering*, Addison-Wesley, Wokingham, England (1990).
26. S. Pugh, Concept selection: a method that works, in D. Clausing and R. Andrade (eds), *Creating Innovative Products Using Total Design*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts (1996).
27. K. N. Otto and K. L. Wood, *Product Design: Techniques in Reverse Engineering and New Product Development*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey (2001).
28. P. G. Rowe, *Design Thinking*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (1987).
29. A. L. Dym, W. H. Wood and M. J. Scott, Rank ordering engineering designs: pairwise comparison charts and borda counts, *Research in Engineering Design*, **13**, 2002, pp. 236–242.
30. A. McAdams and C. L. Dym, Modeling and information in the design process, *Proc., 2004 ASME Design Engineering Technical Conferences*, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 2004.
31. R. A. Howard, Decision analysis: practice and promise, *Management Science*, **34**(6), pp. 679–695, 1988.
32. L. Dym, Representing Designed Artifacts: The Languages of Engineering Design, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, **1**(1), 1994, pp. 75–108.
33. A. Mabogunje and L. J. Leifer, Noun phrases as surrogates for measuring early phases of the mechanical design process, *Proc. 9th Int. Conf. Design Theory and Methodology*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1997.
34. A. Dong, A. W. Hill and A. M. Agogino, A document analysis method for characterizing design team performance, *ASME J. Mech. Design*, **126**(3), pp. 378–385, 2004.
35. A. W. Hill, S. Song, A. Dong and A. M. Agogino, Identifying shared understanding in design using document analysis, *Proc. 13th Int. Conf. Design Theory and Methodology*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 2001. W. Hill, A. Dong and A. M. Agogino, Towards computational tools for supporting the reflective team, *Artificial Intelligence in Design '02*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2002.
36. B. P. Neck, M. L. Connerley and C. C. Manz, Toward a continuum of self-managing team development, in M. M. Beyerlein and D. A. Johnson (Editors), *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams*, 4, JAI Press, Stamford, Connecticut, 1997.
37. S. Song, A. Dong and A. M. Agogino, Time variance of design 'story telling' in engineering design teams, (*CD*) *Proc. Int. Conf. Eng. Design (ICED)*, The Design Society, 2003.

38. K. T. Ulrich and S. D. Eppinger, *Product Design and Development*, 3rd Edn, McGraw-Hill, New York (2003).
39. Do, L. Yi, M. Gross, B. Neiman and C. Zimring, Intentions in and relations among design drawings, *Design Studies*, **21**(5), 2000, pp. 483–503.
40. M. Schutze, P. Sachse and A. Romer, Support value of sketching in the design process, *Research in Engineering Design*, **14**, 2003, pp. 89–97.
41. B. Ullman, S. Wood and D. Craig, The importance of drawing in the mechanical design process, *Computers and Graphics*, **14**(2), 1990, pp. 263–274.
42. S. Song and A. M. Agogino, An analysis of designers' sketching activities in new product design teams, *Pro. 2004 ASME Design Theory and Methodology Conf.*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2004.
43. S. Minneman, The Social Construction of a Technical Reality, doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1991.
44. R. G. Quinn, The fundamentals of engineering: the art of engineering, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **83**(2), 1994, pp. 120–123.
45. B. L. Dym, Teaching Design to Freshmen: Style and Content, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **83**(4), 1994, pp. 303–310.
46. S. D. Sheppard, R. Jenison, A. M. Agogino, M. Bereton, L. L. Bucciarelli, J. Dally, J. Demel, C. L. Dym, D. Evans, R. Faste, M. Henderson, P. Minderman, J. Mitchell, A. Oladipupo, M. Picket-May, R. Quinn, T. Reagan and J. Wujek, Examples of freshman design education, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **13**(4), 1993, pp. 248–261.
47. R. H. Todd, S. D. Magleby, D. D. Sorensen, B. R. Swan and D. K. Anthony, A survey of capstone engineering courses in North America, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **84**(2), 1995, pp. 165–174.
48. M. S. Tooley and D. Kevin, Using a capstone design course to facilitate ABET 2000 program outcomes, *Proc. ASEE Conf. & Exhibition*, Session 1625, 1999.
49. H. W. J. Rittel and M. M. Webber, Dilemmas in a general theory of planning, *Policy Sciences*, **4**, 1973, pp. 155–169.
50. L. L. Bucciarelli, *Designing Engineers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (1994).
51. S. Minneman, The Social Construction of a Technical Reality, doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California (1991).
52. A. M. Agogino and M. C. Linn, Retaining female engineering students: will early design experiences help? Viewpoint Editorial, *NSF Directions*, National Science Foundation, **5**(2), 1992, pp. 8–9.
53. A. G. Carrillo, Engineering Design Team Performance: Quantitative Evidence That Membership Diversity Effects Are Time Dependent, doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 2002.
54. M. R. Barrick, G. L. Stewart, M. J. Neubert and M. K. Mount, Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness, *J. Applied Psychology*, **83**(3), 1998, pp. 377–391.
55. R. R. Reilly, G. S. Lynn and Z. H. Aronson, The role of personality in new product development team performance, *J. Eng. & Technology Management*, **19**(1), 2002, pp. 39–58.
56. B. Wilde, Design team formation using Jungian typology, *Proc. National Collegiate Inventors and Innovators Alliance*, 2000.
57. R. W. Lent, L. Schmidt, J. Schmidt and G. Pertmer, Exploration of collective efficacy beliefs in student project teams: implications for student and team outcomes, *Proc. ASEE Conf. & Exhibition*, 2002.
58. *Engineering Criteria 2000*, Engineering Accreditation Commission of Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology, Baltimore, Maryland (1998).
59. W. C. Oakes, E. J. Coyle and L. H. Jamieson, EPICS: a model of service learning in the engineering curriculum, *Proc. ASEE Conf. & Exhibition*, Session 3630, 2000.
60. A. Whitbeck, *Ethics in Engineering Practice and Research*, Cambridge University Press, New York (1998).
61. L. Dym, A new frontier in engineering ethics: ethics and design, invited luncheon talk, *Int. Con. Ethics in Engineering and Computer Science*, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, March 1999.

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. Dr Dym completed the B. S. C. E. at Cooper Union (1964), an M. S. at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute (1964), and the Ph. D. at Stanford University (1967). He has published more than 100 archival journal articles, proceedings papers and technical reports, served on the editorial boards of several journals, and has edited five volumes and written ten books, the latter 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, ASME, ASCE, and is a member of ASEE. Dr. Dym has received ASCE's Walter L. Huber Research Prize (1980), ASEE's Western Electric Fund Award (1983) and Fred Merryfield Design Award (2002), first runner-up for the Boeing Outstanding Engineering Educator Award (2001), and ASME's Ruth and Joel Spira Outstanding Design Educator Award (2004).



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Robin Adams

Center for Engineering Learning & Teaching
University of Washington
Box 352183
Seattle, WA 98195
Voice: 206-616-0615
Fax: 206-221-3161
Email: radams@engr.washington.edu

Alice M. Agogino

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

Aaron Altman

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

Cynthia J. Atman

Center for Engineering Learning & Teaching
University of Washington
Engineering Annex, Room 223
Stevens Way
College of Engineering
Seattle, WA 98195
Voice: (206) 616-2171
FAX: (206) 221-3161
Email: atman@engr.washington.edu

Reid Bailey

College of Engineering
University of Arizona
1130 N. Mountain Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85721
Voice: (520) 626-2887
FAX: (520) 621-8191
Email: rrbailey@u.arizona.edu

Kurt Becker

Engineering and Technology Education
Utah State University
6000 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322
Voice: (435) 797-2067
FAX: (435) 797-2567
Email: kbecker@cc.usu.edu

Steven Beyerlein

Mechanical Engineering
University of Idaho
P.O. Box 440902
Moscow, ID 83844-0902
Voice: (208) 885-4932
FAX: (208) 885-9031
Email: sbeyer@uidaho.edu

Jim Borgford-Parnell

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



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Anthony Bright

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 607-7940
FAX: (909) 621-8967
Email: abright@hmc.edu

Monica Cardella

Center for Engineering Learning and
Teaching, Industrial Engineering
University of Washington
CELT / Box 352183
Seattle, WA 98195-2180
Voice: (206) 543-5694
FAX: (206) 221-3161
Email: monicaeh@u.washington.edu

Stephen H. Carr

Materials Science and Engineering
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-7379
Email: s.carr@northwestern.edu

Manuel Contero

Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingenieros
Industriales
Departamento de Expresión Gráfica en la
Ingeniería
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia
Edificio 5L
Camino de Vera, s/n
46022 VALENCIA (SPAIN)
Voice: +34 963879512
FAX: +34 963877519
Email: mcontero@degi.upv.es

David Crismond

School of Info Science & Learning
Technologies
University of Missouri
Townsend 303
Columbia, MO 65211
Voice: (573) 882-4768
Email: crismond@missouri.edu

Elisabeth Cuddihy

Technical Communication
University of Washington
Box 352195
Seattle, WA 98195-2195
Voice: (206) 543-2567
Email: ecuddihy@u.washington.edu

Denny C. Davis

Bioengineering Program
Washington State University
PO Box 642710
Pullman, WA 99164-2710
Voice: (509) 335-7993
FAX: (509) 335-4806
Email: davis@wsu.edu

Philip E. Doepker

Mechanical Engineering
University of Dayton
300 College Park Drive
Dayton, OH 45469-0210
Voice: (937) 229-2971
FAX: (937) 229-4922
Email: doepker@udayton.edu



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Clive L. Dym

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

Ozgur Eris

Center for Design Research
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
Voice: (650) 725-0217
FAX: (650) 725-8475
Email: ozgur@stanford.edu

Susan Finger

Civil & Environmental Engineering
Carnegie Mellon
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Voice: (412) 268-8828
FAX: (412) 268-7813
Email: sfinger@ri.cmu.edu

Daniel D. Frey

Mechanical Engineering and Engineering
Systems
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
Voice: (617) 324-6133
Email: danfrey@mit.edu

Richard M. Goff

Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall (0218)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: (540) 231-9537
FAX: (540) 231-6903
Email: richgoff@vt.edu

Peter H. Gregson

Innovation in Design Lab
Dalhousie University
1360 Barrington Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 1Z1
Voice: (902) 494-6377
FAX: (902) 494-2096
Email: idl@dal.ca

Poul Kyvsgaard Hansen

Production, Center for Industrial Production
Aalborg University
Fibigerstraede 16
DK 9220 Aalborg Oest
Denmark
Voice: +45 96358935
FAX: +45 98153030
Email: kyvs@iprod.auc.dk

Tim Healy

Electrical Engineering
Santa Clara University
500 El Camino Real
Santa Clara, CA 95053
Voice: (408) 554-5309
FAX: (408) 554-5474
Email: thealy@scu.edu



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Tom Helliwell

Dean of Faculty
Harvey Mudd College
301 E 12th Street
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: 909-621-8122
Fax: 909-621-8465
Email: thomas_helliwell@hmc.edu

Jonathan Hey

Mechanical Engineering
University of California at Berkeley
6102 Etcheverry Hall
Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94720
Voice: (510) 499-2628
FAX: (510) 642-6163
Email: jono@berkeley.edu

Gul Kremer

School of Engineering Design
Technology and Professional Programs
The Pennsylvania State University
213T Hammond Building
University Park, PA 16802
Voice: (814) 863-1530
FAX: (814) 863-7229
Email: gkremer@psu.edu

John S. Lamancusa

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

Christopher Lewis

Mechanical Engineering
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
Email: clewis@et.byu.edu

Benjamin Linder

Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering
Olin Way
Needham, MA 02492
Voice: (781) 292-2548
FAX: (781) 292-2508
Email: blinder@olin.edu

Christopher L. Magee

Center for Innovation in Product
Development
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
30 Memorial Drive, E60-275
Cambridge, MA 02139
Voice: (617) 252-1077
FAX: (617) 258-0485
Email: cmagee@mit.edu

Ann McKenna

Undergraduate Engineering
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: (847) 491-6761
FAX: (847) 491-5341
Email: mckenna@northwestern.edu



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

John H. McMasters

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

Matthew Mehalik

Scale
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
LRDC - Room 813
Voice: (412) 624-7841
FAX: (412) 624-7439
Email: mmehalik@pitt.edu

Ton Meijknecht

Delft University of Technology
Voorstraat 60
2611 JS Delft
The Netherlands
Voice: +31 15 214 3379
FAX: +31 15 213 6141
Email: t.meijknecht@motiv.tudelft.nl

David Money-Harris

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 607-3623
Email: David_Harris@hmc.edu

Susan Mosborg

Center for Engineering Learning and
Teaching
University of Washington
250 Engineering Annex
Box 352183
Seattle, WA 98195
Voice: (206) 543-5983
FAX: (206) 221-3161
Email: mosborg@u.washington.edu

Kelly Obarski

Teacher Education Curriculum & Instruction
University of Cincinnati
5506 French Hall
PO Box 210230
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0230
Voice: (513) 556-1029
FAX: (513) 218-3138
Email: kobarski@cinci.rr.com

Madara Ogot

School of Engineering Design and
Professional Programs
Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering
Pennsylvania State University
213U Hammond Building
University Park, PA 16801
Voice: (814) 863-1550
FAX: (814) 863-7229
Email: madaraogot@psu.edu

Matthew W. Ohland

General Engineering
Clemson University
104 Holtzendorff Hall
Clemson, SC 29634-0902
Voice: (864) 656-2542
FAX: (864) 656-1327
Email: ohland@clemson.edu



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

David Ollis

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

Greg Olson

Mathematics, Science & Engineering
Northwestern University
Cook Hall
Suite 2021
2225 Campus Drive
Evanston, IL 60208
Voice: 847-491-2847
Fax: 847-491-7820
Email: g-olson@northwestern.edu

Elizabeth J. Orwin

Engineering
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: (909) 621-8572
FAX: (909) 621-8967
Email: elizabeth_orwin@hmc.edu

James W. Pellegrino

Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
Room 1018B; M/C 285
1007 West Harrison Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7137
Voice: (312) 355-2493
FAX: (312) 413-4122
Email: pellegjw@uic.edu

Yoram Reich

Center for Design Research
Stanford University
424 Panama Hall
Stanford, CA 94305-2232
Voice: (650) 723-7911
FAX: (650) 725-8475
Email: yreich@stanford.edu

Linda Schmidt

Mechanical Engineering
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
Voice: (301) 405-0417
Email: lschmidt@umd.edu

Christian Schunn

Scale
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
LRDC - Room 813
Voice: (412) 624-7841
FAX: (412) 624-7439
Email: cschunn@pitt.edu

Sheri D. Sheppard

Mechanical Engineering
Stanford University
503 Terman
Stanford, CA 94305
Voice: (650) 725-1590
FAX: (650) 723-3521
Email: sheppard@stanford.edu



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Durward K. Sobek, II

Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
Montana State University
220 Roberts Hall
Bozeman, MT 59717-3800
Voice: (406) 994-7140
FAX: (406) 994-6292
Email: dsobek@ie.montana.edu

David Socha

Center for Urban Simulation and
Policy Analysis
University of Washington
Box 353055
Seattle, WA 98195
Voice: (206) 616-6628
Email: socha@cs.washington.edu

Suzanne Wegener Soled

Educational Foundations
University of Cincinnati
College of Education
P.O. Box 210002
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002
Voice: (513) 556-3623
FAX: (513) 556-3535
Email: suzanne.soled@uc.edu

Jon Strauss

President
Harvey Mudd College
301 E 12th Street
Claremont, CA 91711
Voice: 909-621-8121
Fax: 909-621-8360
Email: jon_strauss@hmc.edu

Joshua D. Summers

Mechanical Engineering
Clemson University
250 Engineering Innovation Bldg.
Mail Stop 0921
Clemson, SC 29634-0921
Voice: 864-656-3295
Fax: 864-656-4435
Email: joshua.summers@ces.clemson.edu

Janis P. Terpenny

Engineering Education
Virginia Tech
332 Randolph Hall (0218)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Voice: (540) 231-9538
FAX: (540) 231-6903
Email: terpenny@vt.edu

Jennifer Turns

Technical Communication
University of Washington
Box 352195
245 Engineering Annex
Seattle, WA 98125
Voice: (206) 221-3650
FAX: (206) 221-3161
Email: jturns@u.washington.edu

Hans van Drongelen

Delft University of Technology
Voorstraat 60
2611 JS Delft
The Netherlands
Voice: +31 15 212 3421
FAX: +31 15 213 6141
Email: info@motiv.tudelft.nl



Designing Engineering Education List of Participants 19-21 May 2005

Karoly Varadi

Institute of Machine Design
Budapest University of Technology
and Economics
H-111 Muegyetem rkp.3
Budapest
Hungary
Voice: 36-1-463-3507
FAX: 36-1-463-3505
Email: varadik@eik.bme.hu

J. Fredericks Volkwein

Center for Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802-3203
Voice: (814) 865-9739
FAX: (814) 865-3638
Email: volkwein@psu.edu

Joan Walker

Biomedical Engineering
Psychology and Human Development
Vanderbilt University
Station B 351631
Nashville, TN 37235
Voice: (615) 322-6245
FAX: (615) 343-7919
Email: joan.walker@vanderbilt.edu

Edward "Skip" Walter

Attenex Corporation
925 Fourth Avenue
Suite 1700
Seattle, WA 98104
Voice: (206) 373-6501
FAX: (206) 386-5841
Email: skip@attenex.com

John W. Wesner

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

Robert Wicklein

Workforce Education, Leadership, & Social
Foundations
University of Georgia
223 River's Crossing
Athens, GA 30602
Voice: (706) 542-4503
FAX: (706) 542-4054
Email: wickone@uga.edu

Maria Yang

Industrial & Systems Engineering
University of Southern California
3715 McClintock Avenue
GER 201
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Voice: (213) 740-3543
FAX: (213) 740-1120
Email: maria.yang@usc.edu