

A Survey of Engineering, Science and Mathematics Education Centers in the United States*

JED LYONS and CHRISTINE EBERT

University of South Carolina, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Columbia, SC 29208, USA.

E-mail: lyons@sc.edu

A survey of centers in the United States that are engaged in engineering, science or mathematics education was conducted to help understand current practices. The survey addressed sources of funding, types of pre-college outreach activities, activities related to improvement of teaching in higher education, and methods of promoting collaboration between faculty. Also collected were recommendations, based on the experience of the survey respondent, which would help others develop a successful center. Response to the study was high, with 173 of 271 returned. This paper discusses the results and suggests a set of best practices for engineering education centers.

INTRODUCTION

THE UNITED STATES National Science Board recently reported that the number of jobs requiring science and engineering background continues to grow, but the number of citizens who are training to become scientists and engineers is declining [1]. Increasing the number of students prepared to succeed in college can help reverse this trend. Introducing engineering-based curricula in primary and secondary education is one way to improve science and mathematics content knowledge of students [2–9] and improve recruitment efforts. Improving the retention of matriculated students in engineering programs is also advantageous. Improving the pedagogical skills of engineering faculty improves student learning [10–17], and can increase retention rates.

The University of South Carolina is addressing these issues with the support of a Bridges for Engineering Education award from the National Science Foundation. The goals of the grant are to develop a comprehensive and integrated program to:

- (a) improve the pedagogical skills of engineering faculty, including their ability to assess student achievement of learning objectives,
- (b) increase the engineering content in K-12 education,
- (c) increase the engineering content in pre-service teacher education.

As part of this effort, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education approved the creation of a university office called the Center for Engineer-

ing and Computing Education. The center is in the process of developing and implementing a comprehensive and integrated program to enhance engineering education in grades K-16.

Other universities in the United States have or are developing engineering education centers. Representatives of many of these participated in a session at the 2001 Annual Conference of the American Society for Engineering Education entitled 'A Roundtable Discussion of Best Practices for Developing Centers for Engineering Education, Teaching and Learning' [18]. At this meeting, 11 people that were engaged in engineering education centers and 32 others discussed issues and made suggestions for establishing centers for engineering education. Engineering education centers may focus on outreach to primary and secondary school systems, on preparing future faculty, on improving teaching in higher education or other areas not historically addressed by the university's teaching, research or service mission. For example, the Center for Engineering Education at the Colorado School of Mines [19] promotes both educational research and improvements in teaching. The Tufts University Center for Engineering Educational Outreach [20] assists classroom teachers in implementing activity and constructivist-based engineering curricula. The importance of engineering education centers is underscored by the United States National Academy for Engineering's creation of the Center for the Advancement of Scholarship on Engineering Education and its growing number of affiliates [21]. The objective of the current work is to contribute to our understanding of current practices of engineering education, science education and mathematics education centers in the United States through an extensively distributed survey of

* Accepted 14 July 2004.

center directors. This study was initiated to assist the University of South Carolina in the development of its own Center for Engineering and Computing Education, and the results may help others with similar aspirations.

METHODOLOGY

The survey was sent to 271 centers. The surveyed centers were found by one of three methods. First, universities in the United States that have engineering programs were identified from the list maintained by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology [22]. Then the websites of those engineering colleges and departments were browsed in search of education centers and programs for improving college teaching or for K-12 outreach. Secondly, many centers were identified with the Internet search engine Google™ by using key words and phrases like ‘center for engineering education’. Finally, some centers located by these two methods had links to other centers in the target demographic; the latter were also added to the center contact list. It should be noted that the process to survey the centers involves a non-probability method of sampling. The degree to which the sample differs from the total population of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education centers is unknown. In fact, the total number of STEM education centers in the United States is also unknown. Nevertheless, the large number of centers identified through this process is useful for identifying trends and themes currently being explored.

The survey instrument was developed by a team including the authors and a consultant from the university’s Office of Program Evaluation. Important criteria for the survey were that it be short, easy to complete, and that the questions would not be ambiguous. A number of iterations led to the final survey that consisted of the following items:

1. Do you want a copy of the survey summary report?
2. Does your center involve faculty from multiple colleges/departments? If yes, which colleges/departments are involved?
3. How is your center primarily funded?
4. Is your center involved in K-12 programs? If yes, which programs?
5. Does your center have activities related to improvement of teaching in higher education? If yes, which programs?
6. Does your center promote collaborations between faculty in Education and faculty in Science, Mathematics and/or Engineering?
7. Please, give us one recommendation, based on your experience, that would help us develop a successful center.
8. Please, give us the following: center name, your name, position, address, e-mail.

Questions 3, 4, 5 and 6 also included multiple choices that could be selected in response, e.g. ‘by NSF’ for question 3. The questions also included spaces for written responses.

The survey was administered by sending a personal e-mail to the director of each center. The e-mail included the survey as a Microsoft Word® attachment that could be filled out electronically or by hand and returned by e-mail, fax or mail. The e-mail also included a link to an HTML version of the survey that was located on the website of USC’s Center for Engineering and Computing Education [23]. Thus, the center contacts were given four methods to choose to complete the survey; most chose the web-accessible version of the survey to complete.

RESULTS

The survey methodology resulted in the return of 173 completed surveys. The names and website addresses of the centers that responded can be found at [23]. The good response rate of 73% is attributed to the process of survey administration, the short length of the survey, and the enthusiasm of the center directors for improving STEM education. To facilitate data interpretation, the

Table 1. Demographics of centers responding

Type of center	Description	Number of Centers	Percent of Total
Engineering	Situated in a College of Engineering and focused on engineering and/or computer science education; May collaborate with other colleges.	19	11%
Education and science/ engineering	Collaborative center involving Education and Science or Math; may also involve Engineering.	46	27%
University wide	Associated with university administration and engages all colleges.	40	23%
Research center	Primary mission is STEM research.	27	16%
University consortia	Involves multiple universities in STEM education programs.	16	9%
Education	Situated in a College of Education; No explicit STEM collaborators	9	5%
Science	Situated in a College of Science and Math or Arts and Sciences; No explicit Education collaborations.	8	5%
Nonprofit	Non-profit organization engaged in STEM education.	8	5%

responding centers were classified into the eight demographic categories shown in Table 1. The categorizations were developed primarily from the centers' responses to Question 2 on the survey, but were also guided by information posted on the centers' websites. To document and discuss how the survey results varied by center category, all data is presented in subsequent sections in tabular form. Graphs that compare only the engineering-focused centers to the general population are also included to facilitate specific comparisons.

Approximately 11% of the centers that responded to the survey focus explicitly on engineering education at the pre-college or college level. These include centers associated with either a single college or with multiple universities. Such centers are categorized as 'engineering education centers' in this research. Engineering faculty and departments are also involved with some of the centers in other categories. These include the 'education and science/engineering' centers that focus on science or mathematics education and the 'university wide' centers that support all colleges including the STEM disciplines. Centers in the demographic category 'university consortia' involve multiple schools and have a science or mathematics, but not engineering, focus. Centers in the 'education' category are associated with a school or college of education, focus on science and or mathematics education, but do not report collaboration with science or mathematics departments. Similarly, STEM education centers that are associated with a science or mathematics college, but do not report collaboration with an education college, are grouped in the 'science' category. An

interesting finding was that the responses of 27 centers who's primary mission was engineering or scientific research also engaged in education improvement programs.

The number of centers in each category that responded to the survey is shown graphically in Fig. 1. It appears that engineering-focused centers make up a noteworthy fraction of the educational centers in the USA, but there are significantly more centers that involve more than one STEM discipline (i.e. university-wide and education and science/engineering centers).

Funding sources

The survey asked centers how they were funded. Over 80% of the centers indicated State or university support. Slightly over 44% reported funding from the National Science Foundation, 42% from private sources, and 17% from other federal agencies. Other sources of support include user fees and tuition. Table 2 shows a breakdown of funding sources for the different center demographic categories. Engineering education center results are somewhat different from the aggregated results, as shown in Fig. 2. The percentages shown in this and subsequent figures represent the number of centers that provided a particular response, divided by the total number of centers in the particular center category. As shown, the engineering education centers are slightly more likely to be funded by the State or university, by NSF, and by other sources than is the total population of centers. The most striking contrast is that about 80% of the engineering education centers receive support from private sources and donations, which is almost twice the value of the population. Private




Fig. 1. Demographics of centers responding.




Fig. 2. Sources of funding.

sector supporters include businesses, industry, and philanthropic foundations such as Gates and Hewlett-Packard. The results of this survey question suggest that centers for engineering education are more likely to have the financial support of multiple and more varied sources than other centers.

K-12 education programs

Approximately 70% of all centers reported an involvement in K-12 education. Centers reported programs involving on-campus programs for in-service teachers and K-12 students, outreach programs where university students, staff and faculty go into K-12 classes, and on-campus programs for pre-service teachers. About 56% of the centers bring in-service teachers on campus for various programs and activities. A significant number of centers also send university personnel into the K-12 schools: 41% send students, 40% send staff, and 35% send faculty. Other frequently

reported activities include on-campus programs for K-12 students and for pre-service teachers.

Table 3 shows a breakdown of K-12 education activities for the different center demographic categories. The university-wide centers were least likely to be involved in K-12 education; only 30% reported programs or activities in this area. The education and science/engineering centers are most heavily involved in K-12 education and the focus appears to be on the teachers; 98% of these centers had on-campus programs for in-service teachers and 70% of these centers had on-campus programs for pre-service teachers. About 58% of the engineering education centers had K-12 programs, and a significant number of these were involved in many types of K-12 outreach. As shown in Fig. 3, the most frequently reported activities for engineering-focused centers involve college students going into K-12 classes (58% of centers) and in-service teachers coming on-campus (42% of centers).

Table 2. Sources of funding

	State or University	NSF	Private sources	Other Federal Agencies	Other
Engineering	18	10	15	2	2
Education and science/engineering	41	23	18	12	3
University wide	39	3	11	4	1
Research centers	19	23	10	5	1
University consortia	10	11	6	1	1
Education	6	0	3	1	2
Science	6	2	4	1	0
Nonprofit	3	4	5	3	0
All centers	142	76	72	29	10

Table 3. Programs for enhancing STEM education in K-12

	In-service teachers on campus	Students go into K-12 classes	Staff go into K-12 classes	Faculty go into K-12 classes	K-12 students on campus	Pre-service teacher programs
Engineering	8	11	6	6	7	4
Education and Science/Engineering	45	27	30	30	22	32
University Wide	8	5	6	2	2	4
Research Centers	9	8	11	10	18	1
University Consortia	11	12	7	6	4	10
Education	6	6	4	3	4	4
Science	5	1	2	3	3	0
Nonprofit	5	1	3	1	0	2
All centers	97	71	69	61	60	57

Higher education improvement programs

The survey asked if the centers were involved in activities related to improvement of teaching in higher education. Approximately 71% of all the centers reported one or more program related to college teaching. It is interesting to note that over half of these also reported K-12 education programs. Considering all centers together, the most common approaches used to improve college teaching were workshops and seminars for faculty (57%), coaching and mentoring activities (35%) and grant and fellowship programs (34%). Other programs cited by the survey respondents include programs for graduate students, course and curriculum development projects, and assessment activities.

Table 4 shows a breakdown of higher education-related activities for the different center demographic categories. The university-wide centers

were most likely to be involved in higher education improvement; 90% of these centers reported involvement in this area. Centers that were least likely to be involved in this area are those situated in a college of education and without explicit STEM collaborators. Only 33% of these centers reported engagement in improving teaching in higher education. Ninety percent of the engineering education centers reported one or more program aimed at improving higher education. As shown in Fig. 4, engineering-focused centers more frequently engage in workshops and seminars for faculty and in coaching and mentoring activities than the total population of centers responding, but were less likely to provide grants and fellowships.

Promoting collaboration

Centers were asked if they promote collaborations between faculty in education and faculty in




Fig. 3. Programs for enhancing STEM education in K-1.

Table 4. Programs for improving teaching in higher education

	Workshops & seminars for faculty	Coaching and mentoring	Grants and fellowships	Graduate student programs	Course/ curriculum development	Assessment	Other
Engineering	13	10	5	2	1	1	2
Education and science/ engineering	24	12	15	3	4	0	4
University wide	31	27	24	9	1	7	3
Research centers	12	3	6	0	1	0	1
University consortia	9	5	5	5	1	0	1
Education	3	2	1	1	0	0	1
Nonprofit	2	1	1	0	0	0	2
Science	4	2	1	0	0	0	0
All Centers	98	62	58	20	8	8	14




Fig. 4. Programs for improving teaching in higher education.

Table 5. Activities for promoting cross-college collaboration

	Joint workshops and seminars	Proposal writing support	Cross-college peer mentoring	Seed grants & funding	Courses & curriculum	Sponsored programs & research	Joint education programs or team teaching	Assessment	Other
Engineering	7	8	2	3	3	3	2	2	1
Education and science/ engineering	26	26	10	7	11	11	5	0	4
University wide	19	8	11	7	1	1	0	1	1
Research centers	9	7	4	7	1	3	1	1	0
University consortia	12	5	2	5	7	4	3	0	1
Education	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
Science	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonprofit	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	2
All centers	81	58	32	31	24	24	12	4	9

science, mathematics and/or engineering. About 74% of the centers responded with one or more activities in this area. The most common activities involve joint workshops and seminars (47%) and proposal writing support (34%). Other activities

include cross-college peer mentoring programs (18%), seed grants (18%) and course & curriculum development and delivery (14%). Only 14% of the centers responded that their sponsored programs and research promote collaborations across




Fig. 5. Activities for promoting cross-college collaboration.

colleges. This percentage may be much higher, considering the variety of funding sources discussed above. Joint education programs, team teaching and assessment activities were also reported to promote collaboration.

Table 5 shows a breakdown of the types of collaboration-promoting activities for the different center demographic categories. Not surprisingly, 100% of the university consortia reported collaboration-building activities. The most frequent were joint workshops and seminars (75%) and course and curriculum development and delivery (44%). Least likely to promote collaborations were centers situated in a single college such as the education centers or science education centers. As shown in Fig. 5, the engineering focused centers were similar to the total population in terms of how they promoted collaborations across colleges. Significant distinctions are that the engineering education centers are more likely to promote collaborations through proposal writing support and assessment activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUCCESS

About 85% of the returned surveys included a response to the question 'please, give us one recommendation, based on your experience that would help us develop a successful center.' This is a good response rate, considering that the survey did not suggest a definition of success. Of the 147 responses that were provided, 33 included more than one recommendation and several included as

many as four. A content analysis was performed to code the recommendations into fourteen themes, as discussed below. The frequency of responses for these categories is shown in Fig. 6.

- *Engage the faculty.* Thirty centers made recommendations to engage the faculty in the activities of the center. Most of these suggestions were to listen to the faculty and respond to their needs or to develop solutions in collaboration with your constituency. It was also suggested to avoid the 'build it and they will come' mentality. One respondent recommended reaching out to as many departments as possible, whereas another suggested the core faculty should be limited in number. Developing a culture of 'faculty working with faculty' was also suggested.
- *Interdisciplinary collaboration.* Twenty-three centers suggested that collaboration and partnerships are keys to successes. Potential partners should be viewed as allies rather than as competitors. Partners that were suggested included faculty in the fields of education, science, mathematics, engineering and the business community. It was also suggested to develop strong collaborations between the domain experts in STEM disciplines and learning scientists in education. Monthly meetings to network and collaborate were suggested as a way to promote collaboration. It was cited as important that the participants respect and embrace the importance of interdisciplinary approaches in addressing the challenges of teaching in K-20 settings.




Fig. 6. Recommendations to develop a successful center.

- *Leadership, organization and staffing.* Nineteen centers made recommendations about the importance of effective leadership, organization and staffing for the center. These included a leader passionate about teaching and learning and a team of persons with varied backgrounds and experiences. Several stated that an external advisory board can provide totally different perspectives on the issues as well as give more credibility (hence, buy-in) on the services of a center. One respondent noted the need to provide adequate time for administration, saying 'it will take much more time than you anticipate.' It is interesting that one recommended that the 'home' of the Center be a college to reduce vulnerability to budget cuts, whereas another recommended to make the center independent of a college, so that the dean or faculty cannot attempt to control or siphon on the resources.
- *Alignment with audience interests.* Eighteen centers stressed the need to make sure the participants in center activities take ownership of the projects. It was suggested to conduct a needs analysis of the target population. Those who will be involved in and use the center should carefully discuss their needs and what activities are going to take place. Design and organization of the facility should flow from that. One respondent cautioned to 'be ready for implementation dips (i.e. don't give up).'
- *University support and culture.* Seventeen recommendations were related to the support and culture of the university at which the center is located. The major theme was to be aware of what the institution or department values and to work from within. Active support (not just monetary) of chairs, deans and the central administration were cited as important by several.
- *Clear mission.* The recommendations of fifteen centers were related to having clearly stated goals and a focus for the activities. It was recommended that the mission statement should be achievable, yet broad enough to avoid limits. Staying true to the mission was also cited as important in three responses, including 'don't get sidetracked on things that might be nice to do' and 'avoid following the money trail.'
- *Funding and support.* Fourteen of the respondents made recommendations specifically about monetary support. Many recommended that a solid base of institutional financial support is the key to long term successes. Encouragement to obtain external funding was also given, including endowments, federal funding and private sources. One respondent proclaimed, 'building a center using only soft money will not enable the center to be sustained!'
- *Treat people well.* Recommendations for treating the center's clientele as professionals were made by seven respondents. It was suggested to be aware of the demanding schedule of K-12 teachers and to include honoraria, meals, substitutes and other items in planning collaborative activities with/for them. Another recommendation was to 'make it exciting!'

- *Educational research base.* Seven recommendations related specifically to educational research. It was suggested to be knowledgeable about important developments in education including research on teaching, to use the research literature to interest the faculty in learning about learning, and to convince faculty from the content areas to approach teaching and learning as a scholarly endeavor. A focus on research was suggested as a way to encourage faculty who face pressure to publish to collaborate on center activities.
- *External networking.* Seven center directors recommended networking with other center directors, professional organizations, and other state agencies. Active engagement in the Professional and Organizational Development Network [24] was suggested by three respondents.
- *Communication and visibility.* Six recommendations focused on substantive communication between participants or on a high visibility of the center and its products. It was suggested to 'talk and talk again' and to chronicle all activities. Having a talented webmaster that has a clear understanding of the project's goals was recommended.
- *Assess and evaluate.* Six respondents made recommendations relating to assessment and evaluation of the center's activities. It was suggested to assess new programs as they are implemented to make appropriate changes, to assess the learning that occurs in mature programs, and to evaluate the goals and effectiveness of the center yearly.
- *Summer salary and rewards.* Eight recommendations indicated that incentives for faculty to participate are needed. These included finding a way to count their efforts towards promotion and/or tenure, providing summer salary, or providing computers or other technology.
- *Other recommendations.* Seven respondents made recommendations for a specific program to implement. These were varied and reflected the target audience of the individual centers. For example centers focused on improving teaching in higher education recommended peer observations, workshops or reciprocal mentoring. Summer programs for K-12 students and teachers were recommended by other centers. Nine other recommendations were received that did not fit the major categories. These included work hard on areas with potential impact, put teaching first in everything you do, encourage graduate students to be involved, be entrepreneurial, and think out of the box.

DISCUSSION

Harding and Finelli [18] reported a number of recommendations for establishing engineering education centers that came out of a roundtable

discussion at the 2001 ASEE meeting. It is noteworthy that the results of the roundtable compare to the results of this survey. For example, the roundtable discussed 'developing support for a teaching and learning center.' The importance of university support was cited by 21% of the engineering education centers that responded. The roundtable discussed 'engaging faculty in programs developed by teaching and learning centers.' Forty-two percent of the engineering education centers that responded to this survey made recommendations in this area. 'Relating teaching and learning center innovations to assessment efforts' was also discussed at the roundtable. Recommendations from the responding engineering education centers included assessment and evaluation (16%) and connecting with the educational research base (21%). The roundtable also discussed 'providing opportunities for other institutions to benefit from existing teaching and learning centers' and 'maintaining useful contacts among current and future centers for teaching and learning.' None of the engineering education centers that responded to the survey made recommendations related to networking or communication. However 37% of the engineering center responses did recommend interdisciplinary collaborations.

CONCLUSION

The results of the survey show that STEM-related education centers vary widely in their focus and activities. However, based on current practices the authors can postulate what the characteristics of a successful center could be. A successful engineering education center should be led by an individual passionate about teaching and learning. It should have a clearly-defined mission that is developed by a group of core faculty and that is guided by frequent input from the constituencies served by the center. It should be aligned with the values of its home (the institution or department) and should work from within that culture. The center should obtain funding from a variety of sources. However, direct support from the university is critical. The center's outreach activities should send college students into K-12 and should bring K-12 teachers onto the university campus. Programs for improving higher education should include workshops for faculty as well as individual interactions. Collaborations between faculty in education and engineering should be promoted through sponsored programs and research that is mutually beneficial to the collaborators. Organizing seminars and meetings can help these faculty members establish connections. Assessing the center's programs and communicating these to the faculty are important to interesting the faculty in learning about learning or in engaging

in educational research. Finally, the successful center will find a niche, stay focused and treat people well.

Acknowledgement—This work was supported by the National Science Foundation's Bridges for Engineering Education

program through Award # 0230624. We would especially like to thank those who responded to the survey. For those centers that did not receive a questionnaire, we apologize for our oversight and welcome your input. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2004 International Conference on Engineering Education and Research [25].

REFERENCES

1. National Science Board, *Science and Engineering Indicators 2004*, (2004). www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/seind04/
2. L. Carlson and J. F. Sullivan, Exploiting design to inspire interest in engineering across the K-16 engineering curriculum, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **20**(8), 2004, pp. 372–378.
3. Igor M. Verner and David J. Ahlgren, Fire-fighting robot contest: interdisciplinary design curricula in college and high school, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, July 2002.
4. Douglas R. Carroll, Bridge engineering for the elementary grades, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, July 1997.
5. L. S. Chumbley, C. P. Hargrave, K. Constant, B. Hand, T. Andre and E. A. Thompson, Project ExCEL: Web-based scanning electron microscopy for K-12 education, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, April 2002.
6. Michael A. Mooney and Timothy A. Laubach, Adventure engineering: a design centered, inquiry based approach to middle grade science and mathematics education, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, July 2002.
7. Y. D. Pols, C. B. Rogers and I. N. Miaoulis, Hands-On Aeronautics for Middle Students, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, July 1994.
8. Susan J. Poole, Janet L. deGrazia and Jacquelyn F. Sullivan, Assessing K-12 pre-engineering outreach programs, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, January 2001.
9. Michael D. Symans, Introducing middle school students to engineering principles using educational bridge design software, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, July 2000.
10. P. C. Wankat, Educating engineering professors in education, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **88**(4), 1999, pp. 471–475.
11. M. Reichert and M. Absher, Taking another look at educating African-American engineers: the importance of undergraduate retention, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **86**(3), 1997, pp. 241–253.
12. B. Bender, Concepts for purposive and motivational teaching and learning in engineering design courses, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **17**(4–5), 2001, pp. 336–342.
13. D. G. Taylor, S. P. Magleby, R. H. Todd and A. R. Parkinson, Training Faculty to Coach Capstone Design Teams, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **17**(4–5), 2001, pp. 353–358.
14. C. Brawner, R. M. Felder, R. Allen and R. Brent, A survey of faculty teaching practices and involvement in faculty development activities, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **91**(4), 2002, pp. 393–396.
15. Williams, P. Turrell and R. Wall, Let's TWIST: creating a conducive learning environment for women, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **18**(4), 2002, pp. 447–451.
16. R. Brent and R. M. Felder, A model for engineering faculty development, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **19**(2), 2003, pp. 234–240.
17. Y.-Y. Chen, J. Lyu and Y.-C. Lin, Education improvement through ISO 9000 implementation: experiences in Taiwan, *Int. J. Eng. Educ.*, **20**(1), 2004, pp. 91–95.
18. T. Harding and C. Finelli, Suggestions for establishing centers for engineering education, *Proc. 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Conference & Exposition*.
19. R. Streveler, B. Moskal, R. Miller and M. Pavelich, The Center for Engineering Education at the Colorado School of Mines, *J. Eng. Educ.*, **90**(3), 2001, pp. 361–387.
20. M. Rushton, M. Cyr, B. Gravel and L. Prouty, Infusing engineering into public schools, *Proc. 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Conference & Exposition*.
21. National Academy for Engineering, Center for the Advancement of Scholarship on Engineering Education (2004). www.nae.edu/NAE/casecomnew.nsf
22. Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Accredited Programs (2003). www.abet.org/accredited_prgrs.html
23. Center for Engineering and Computing Education, Science Mathematics Engineering and Technology (SMET) Education Centers Survey (2003). <http://cece.engr.sc.edu/SMETsurvey.html>
24. Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (2004). www.podnetwork.org/
25. J. Lyons and C. Ebert, The state of engineering, science and mathematics education centers in the United States, *Proc. Int. Conf. Engineering Education and Research*, June 2004, Olomouc, Czech Republic.

Jed Lyons is an Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Director of the Center for Engineering and Computing Education at the University of South Carolina. He received his BS, MS and Ph.D. degrees from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1984, 1987 and 1990, respectively. His interests include research on experimental design, problem based learning and active learning. His honors include the Litman Distinguished Professor Award and the Mungo Outstanding Teaching Award from the University of South Carolina, Outstanding Young Engineering Alumni from the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Christine Ebert is a Professor of Science Education in the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education and Associate Dean of The Graduate School. Her interests include providing instructional support for graduate teaching assistants, preparing future faculty, inventing and creative problem solving, and misconceptions in science. The author of four books, she primarily teaches elementary science methods courses.