

Integrating Social Aspects and Group Work Aspects in Engineering Design Education*

ESWARAN SUBRAHMANIAN, ARTHUR WESTERBERG, SAROSH TALUKDAR,
JAMES GARRETT, ANNETTE JACOBSON, CHRIS PAREDIS, CRISTINA AMON
Institute for Complex Engineered Systems, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 51213, USA.
E-mail: sub@cmu.edu

PAULIEN HERDER and ADAM TURK
Energy and Industry Group, Delft University of Technology, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

This paper describes two design project courses we teach at CMU, both emphasizing the importance of the social aspects of design. The first, taught collaboratively with Delft University, asks students to formulate, but never solve, a series of design problems. Students move from individually solving a series of simple problems to solving or interpreting larger problems as cross-Atlantic teams. A second product design projects course is available to all CMU students, with projects supported both technically and financially by industrial sponsors. Students learn the value of multidisciplinary teaming and of having real problems on which to work. We place emphasis on the teams discovering the 'right' problem on which to work. Projects span two terms, with the second term team members learning first hand about the difficulties of project hand-off. In both courses, students learn from each other through weekly project presentations. Also, in both courses, everyone—faculty, industrial partners and students—places, organizes and shares all information electronically within LIRÉ, our web-based document management system. Finally, for the first course, almost all CMU lectures and student presentations for the past two years are available as web-available streaming video movies.

INTRODUCTION

OVER THE LAST several years, the Institute for Complex Engineered Systems (ICES), from its origins as the Engineering Design Research Center (EDRC), has evolved two elective courses addressing the social and group aspects of engineering design. These courses are offered to students in the engineering undergraduate curricula as part of a design minor. The importance of these courses can be understood in light of the statement in the Report by the National Academy of Engineering on 'Engineering as a Social Enterprise' that about 2% of the population of the United States are engineers [1]. The social impact of engineers on the day-to-day lives of ordinary people is immense, and creating an awareness of their impact on society has been rather sparse in current engineering education. The two courses taught at ICES are distinct in character in that they address social and group work issues at two different levels: a course on formulating engineering problems and a product design course that has industrial partners as clients. The first course is open only to engineering majors, while the second course is open to all students on campus. In the fall of 2000 we

extended the first course to be a cross Atlantic joint course taught simultaneously at both TU Delft in the Netherlands and CMU. The primary goal of the problem formulation course has been to emphasize the importance of negotiations and tradeoffs among the stakeholders in the formulation of any design problem. Further, we emphasize the need for a precise articulation of the problem to serve as a contractual agreement among the stakeholders.

This second course has attracted students with majors from industrial design, technical writing, and human computer interaction, as well as students from all of the engineering disciplines. This course is a project course with the objectives of having students work together in a group with an industrial partner and of cultivating within the students a healthy respect for other disciplines and their high value in contributing to engineering design. An important aspect of both of these courses is we have the students learn by doing and from exemplars before we teach them the generalizations. This approach is usually much more interesting and is the reverse of much of the lecturing they see in many of their classes [2].

In the next sections we shall lay out the pedagogical objectives of these two courses and the experience we have gained in teaching them. In the concluding section, we contend that these two

* Accepted 3 September 2002.

courses are complementary and are very important in creating a well-rounded multi-dimensional (social and technical) perspective on the role of engineering design in society.

**PROBLEM FORMULATION IN
ENGINEERING DESIGN**
(Herder, Subramanian, Talukdar, Turk and
Westerberg)

From 1989 to 1996, we taught this course as an engineering process and methods course as one of the EDRC design minor courses at CMU. We based the method of teaching on lectures and assignments and on a term project to formulate and solve a given design problem. During these years, we were uneasy about the way students approached problem formulation, which led us to understand that our students were good at solving well-structured problems but had difficulty in structuring and articulating new problems.

To address this deficiency we radically changed the structure of the course 1997. In its new format, the primary objective of the course is to teach the process of problem formulation and the role of mathematical and other modeling techniques to aid in engineering design problem formulation. We do not ask the students to solve problems, only to formulate them. To this end, we have adopted a strategy by which we make the students focus on articulating the design problem by using a four-part description of design problems:

1. Goals (as objectives and constraints).
2. Tests.
3. Design spaces.
4. Starting points.

Here the pedagogical objective is to get the students to understand that articulating the right problem, based on a process of negotiation and clear representation of the problem among the stakeholders and the design team, is more important than being able to solve perfectly the wrong problem. It is our belief that rationality in design cannot be assigned just to the mathematical solution process. Articulating the right problem is an integral part of rationality and is a socially negotiated process [3, 4].

This course attempts to raise awareness of this perspective. We ask students initially to formulate a number of small design problems—such as designing the best route from CMU to the airport. They do some of these problems individually to become familiar with the use of the basic framework of goals, tests, design spaces and starting points and with the use of mathematics as a language for articulating and unambiguously representing a problem. Once they are reasonably familiar with this way to recast problems, we then escalate to larger group-based assignments. At least one such project includes uncovering the formulation of an existing design project. The

large assignments include design problems, such as design of a transportation system for Pittsburgh and the design of a water/sewage system for a new housing development near Amsterdam. Each week the students present their solutions to the class. Students thereby watch how other groups approach similar or even the same problems. The instructors serve as stakeholders for many of the problems. We introduce models of formulation from optimization (linear, nonlinear, mixed integer), mathematical logic, game theory, information systems, organizational design and ethics through exemplars from real design problems.

Finally the student groups are asked to read and report both orally and as written reports on books from a list we provide in the area of engineering and design. They are not to meet face-to-face in preparing their reports, but rather they may only communicate electronically, for example, by e-mail, phone, and chat. The books included have been on the design of the SR-71, of computers, and of the New York City water system; on the evolution of the design of air conditioners; and many of Petroski's books. The students were to analyze the design exemplars in the books and characterize them by using the four-part description we present to aid in formulating design problems.

International experiment with TU-Delft

Last fall CMU and TU-Delft conducted their first international experiment. We shared lectures through video exchange, and we organized the students as groups spanning both institutions. In order to make the transition to an internationally taught course as smooth as possible, the Dutch instructors attended parts of the course when it was taught at CMU in the Fall of 1999. After concluding that this course would be very valuable also for Delft University (TUD) students, we set up an experiment for the Fall of 2000. This experiment comprised teaching (for instructors) and taking (for students) the course at the same time at the two different locations, with the use of as much as possible of each other's material and expertise. We spent a month of planning in the summer of 2000 to plan the course with respect to its contents and organization. Besides the technical issues that we had to solve, we had to overcome organizational intricacies such as timing and schedule differences. We do not discuss the latter in this paper, however.

The experiment we ran in teaching a course at the same time in two countries has been an educational one. We found that the use of video clips, in the way we used them in a classroom, has an added value. Students and instructors saw and presented different views on a subject, which improved understanding. We had expected the students to use the video clips as background material; they did not. The assigned problems had mixed settings in Europe and in the US, thereby suggesting the need for differences in

preferences. Everyone in the class saw these very interesting differences arising as they articulated their problems.

The collaboration between the international groups was problematic in the beginning, as students had to become comfortable with the use of the various tools. With e-mailing, in particular, delay time caused by a six-hour time difference remained a serious issue. Interactive collaboration tools, like chatting or telephoning, proved to be vital for some groups. The students used LIRÉ, a document management system developed at CMU within ICES. They captured and organized all their documents, presentations and reports on-line for easy exchange and collaboration. A complete repository is available of the problems we have used in this course since 1996. Students could and did review previous problems to aid in solving their assignments. We have now captured all the video lectures from this last term as well.

We found that Delft faculty could use video lectures that CMU faculty created, but, because of technical difficulties, this proved very difficult. We learned that students at Delft did not go back and look at the videotapes as they turned out to be too long. A postmortem of the course found that when they did use the videos, the students liked them as they could stop and discuss them while watching. This discussion woke them up, provided understanding of missed points, and so forth. To overcome the 'too long' complaint, we plan to partition these tapes into short topical clips for use next fall. A report in the book entitled *Social Life of Information* [5] inspired us to use video as a medium around which to run the class. This report described how students in industry using video lectures from a university performed better than the students watching the live lecture. The report attributed this improved performance to the students' ability to interrupt and discuss lecture material as the lecture progressed. We feel this approach was useful, but it needs refinement based on the student suggestions. Herder *et al.* [6], give more details on our experience in using video and other electronic technologies in this course.

In summary the purpose of the course is to create an understanding of how contexts and stakeholders determine the scope of the problem and how mathematical and other models can be used to articulate the problem. The emphasis here is on the role that models and methods play in the articulation and consensus building, rather than focusing only on how they allow one to solve the design problem. Student enthusiasm confirmed an added value to our collaborating across the Atlantic Ocean. They often mentioned that the experience could be like expected future real life situations. This collaborating with people with different perspectives at different times and places was, to them, the most valuable feature of the international part of the course.

PRODUCT DESIGN COURSE (Subrahmanian, Westerberg, Garrett, Amon, Jacobson, Paredis)

In the past few years many of our students have been extremely interested in joining startup companies. They were of course dreaming of the excitement and of the potential early wealth. Four years ago, CMU and Lehigh University had Engineering Research Centers that were finishing their eleventh year and thus were graduating from having NSF funding. Our two universities approached the state of Pennsylvania to obtain alternative support for our respective centers, proposing to coordinate our efforts and direct them to local government and industry. One aspect we considered carefully was how to increase the retention of our engineering students within the state. We proposed creating a course that would connect local government and industry with our students, where the students would work on small design problems relevant to these organizations.

We endeavored to learn of courses taught elsewhere that might have a format we could emulate. We knew of a design project course at the University of Florida where students from throughout their engineering college participate for their entire senior year. Industry supplies both the problem descriptions and about \$15,000 of funding for each project. The university provides space and a faculty member who leads each project. About \$3000 of the funding becomes an unrestricted fund for use by this faculty member.

We also knew of entrepreneurial engineering courses at Stanford. We quickly became aware that many product design courses exist in many universities, including within CMU and Lehigh. These courses were typically within or closely tied to Mechanical Engineering Departments.

We elected to create an engineering design project course—but with a difference. The stated goals for our course were the following:

- increase retention of students within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
- give students real problems on which to work;
- give them experience with the type of problem they could encounter in a startup;
- have the students learn how to improve the design processes in which they participate;
- make the students much more aware of the many important non-technical aspects of design.

There are many aspects to engineering design our students typically will not see in a traditional capstone course. Student design teams are homogeneous, i.e., members are all one brand of engineer working on a problem type familiar to them. If someone leaves, someone else on the team can likely fill in quite easily. They typically do not experience project hand-off from one team to another. The design problems often have a well-defined objective, for example, make 15% return

on investment. They seldom think retrospectively about the design process itself.

To make this experience more interesting to the students and motivated by the goals stated above, we now have the following guidelines for our course. We have evolved these over time. The course is for four semester credits.

Any junior, senior or graduate student on campus can participate. Indeed we actively solicit students from all colleges. And we deliberately create teams with very diverse membership. We had industrial designers and graduate electrical engineers working on a laser tape. The EE students remarked that the product would certainly have been a failure even with the best analogue circuit if it had not been properly packaged and had the right intuitive buttons to push. English majors are not there just to write reports either. They take lead roles in organizing lectures, establishing protocols to discover stakeholder needs, and so forth. On an oil cleanup product, the non-chemists and chemical engineers looked at packaging, environmental impact, delivery and so forth.

Each project can last as long as needed, with one year being a guideline. We started off believing each would be one year, but that was an artificial constraint for this course. We removed it. New projects start in any term, as needed and as available.

Each project has a government or industrial partner who provides the initial problem definition (for example, to design a device to teach young asthma patients how to control their asthma), technical support, and \$15,000 funding per year. The state funding we get allows us to cost share this funding under special circumstances.

Students can take the course for one or two terms. Either option will be beneficial. Most do take it for one term only.

We capture all paperwork electronically for the course. We want students to be able to access and use the available information, including that available for the other projects. This capture is also part of solving the handoff problem between terms when new teams pick up an existing project. Finally, we want a history from which we may all benefit in the future.

There is one ninety minute class meeting each week. It is a non-threatening time of sharing.

All students continually learn about all ongoing projects, and they help each other. There are to be NO secrets. Each project emphasizes only some of the interesting aspects of design, so, by observing closely all projects and to some extent being 'sounding boards' for all projects, students gain a better appreciation of more of the issues.

Students learn from each other—a guideline that is closely related to the previous one.

We want students to understand the need for any of the methods we introduce and have the option to use and/or modify them as they wish. There are no 'sacred' methods.

The design is of a product. This decision is very

deliberate. We suggest that products offer a very interesting experience. Products may be crudely defined as packaging highly technical things in a way that others can use them. It would be scary indeed if we had to understand the technology in all the things we need and use. The real world is all about products. The features products provide often define their success as much or more than the technologies within them. They tend to have short lives in the market place, always being displaced quickly by something with better features.

We started slowly. In our first term, Fall, 1998, we had only one project: the design of a distributed agent traffic control system with Bosch being the industrial partner. This experiment encouraged us to develop the larger course, which we have now taught five semesters in a row. It now typically has five projects each term and about 25 to 30 students.

From the time of the first course, students and faculty have stored all documents in the web-accessible document management system, LIRÉ (LIVING REpository) [7], which our n -dim research group created while working with an industrial partner. With the feedback we get, we continually improve this system, and today it is really a very nice system. Among LIRÉ features are access control, notification when things are added or changed, arbitrary linking of documents, searching, and the automatic converting of all documents to a viewable form (generally a pdf).

We instituted having the students give five-minute progress reports every week very early in this course. Progress reporting is a great way to assure progress every week. Students do not like being embarrassed with reports that admit to doing little or nothing the week before.

A feature we instituted in the spring of 2000 was to have the students prepare and present the lectures on the methods that the text [8] presents as being useful for student-sized product design projects. It could appear we are being lazy. However, this is every bit as much work for us. Our rationale is that we have had a lot of experience teaching. They will have to lecture a lot when they are in their future jobs. Perhaps we can impart some ideas on how to create interesting lectures to them. We have issued guidelines telling the students how we think they should prepare a lecture.

The most important guideline we give to them is to teach by example first, then generalize. Each week one group prepares its notes and then meets on Thursday with us for about an hour. We discuss their lecture in detail. They almost always prepare their lecture by presenting the method in general terms and then applying it. Basically they prepare a pretty dry lecture. We discuss with them the advantages of applying it and then generalizing it. We show them how they can engage the students. On Monday they return with their next version. This one-hour discussion leads to the

version they teach on Tuesday. Their lecture lasts 30 minutes. As faculty we do not save time this way. It takes us as long or longer to teach them how to prepare the lecture as it would for us to do it ourselves. But, amazingly, they always prepare great lectures, better than we would have. The students actually clap after the first such lecture every term (and then by courtesy after all the others for the rest of the term). Each group creates two lectures each term. In the first they use Power-Point slides, but in the second they can only use the blackboard. The second makes them much more nervous. We have to control them to stop them from having one person fill a board while a second erases it or while a second starts to write 'ahead' of the lecture. We try very hard to get them to put up just enough for good notes. We tell them that lectures are not to be 'core dumps' of vast amount of material. All in all it is fun for everyone. And we ask them to look at the lectures they now sit in and to assess why they do or do not work well.

Once the lecture is completed, the students then work for about 20 minutes with the other groups to apply the method they just taught to the other projects. At first this application was for one project with the whole class watching. This term, however, each member of the lecturing team has gone to a separate group and been the expert. The students get to learn another lesson with this activity: just how hard it is to get started when applying a method. For example, the list of product features does not magically appear as it seems to do in the lecture.

We do NOT grade the lecturing nor the project summaries. Peer pressure really assures us these are done well.

We like to think that this type of course may be a far better capstone course for our students than the domain-specific design courses they now take in engineering. The domain-specific course should still exist as it is often where we teach students those tools that our disciplines have available to aid in design. For example, we teach students about simulators, about synthesis insights, and so forth, related to chemical process design in chemical engineering.

But product design where we involve all students on campus requires a broader use of all that students learn in their university experience. Shouldn't that be a better capstone course? (Yes, we know: where will we find room for it in our curricula?)

CONCLUSIONS

The interaction of the social and the technical in

engineering design is indisputable. While engineering curricula have concentrated much on the science of engineering, social and work aspects have been generally put on the back burner. Recently several universities and institutions such as Harvey Mudd, Stanford, the University of Florida and others have introduced different models for the introduction of courses to address this deficiency. We at CMU have borrowed ideas from others and have refined the course over several years to address various pedagogical issues that we found wanting in the current curricula. However, the three primary principles that have guided the development of these courses are

- learning by doing;
- teaching from exemplars to generalizations;
- learning from each other and respecting each others skills and perspectives.

Both courses typically have 20 to 30 students. Students like the courses. They understand that they are participating in an educational experiment. Students often give us suggestions on how to improve their educational experience, and many of these are now part of the courses. The two courses are complementary, as they require skills at different levels of social interaction and group dynamics in the different phases of design.

We believe that the problem formulation course, with its framework of goals, tests, design spaces and starting points, provides a critical way of not only articulating new design contexts but also of analyzing existing designs to uncover their underlying assumptions and goals. The second course emphasizes communications, reconciliation, use of methods for systematic translations from user needs to product definitions and implementation. Many of our students from the first course take the second and vice versa—a casual empirical observation on the student interest in these course. We intend to continue to learn from experiences of others and our own experiences along with maintaining an openness for suggestions from the students and our industrial partners to make it a rich educational experience that sets the students up for a lifetime of learning.

Acknowledgements—We would like to thank all the companies that have participated in the product design course and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its PITA funds that support ICES. For the problem formulation course, we would like to thank the CMU International Education Fund.

REFERENCES

1. Hedy E. Sladovich, (ed.), *Engineering as Social Enterprise*, National Academy of Engineering, National Academy Press (1991).

2. Richard Felder, Reaching the second tier: learning and teaching styles in college science education, *J. College Science Teaching*, **23**(5), 1993, pp. 286–290.
3. L. L. Bucciarelli, An ethnographic perspective on engineering design, *Design Studies*, **9**(3), July 1988, pp. 159–168.
4. L. L. Bucciarelli, Rationality in design, *Proc. Workshop on the Role of Objects in Design, European Conference on Co-operative Work (ECOOP2000)*, St. Antapolis, France, 2000.
5. J. S. Brown, P. Duguid, *Social Life of Information*, Harvard Business Press (2000).
6. P. M. Herder, E. Subrahmanian, S. Talukdar, A. L. Turk, and A. W. Westerberg, Web-based communications in teaching: a distance-teaching and cross-Atlantic collaboration experiment, *Proc. Int. Seminar on Information and Communication Technologies in Engineering Education*, Galway, Ireland, May 2–4, 2001.
7. J. G. Davis, E. Subrahmanian, S. L. Konda, H. Granger, M. Collins, and A. W. Westerberg, Creating shared information spaces for collaborative product design, *Information Systems Frontiers*, (to appear), August 2001.
8. C. L. Dym and P. Little, *Engineering Design*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1999).

Eswaran Subrahmanian is a Principal Research Scientist at the Institute for Complex Engineered System (ICES) at Carnegie Mellon University. His research interests are in the area of design research, design information systems and design education.

Arthur Westerberg is the Swearingen University Professor of Chemical Engineering and ICES, Carnegie Mellon University. His research interests are design research and education and process systems engineering.

Sarosh Talukdar is a Professor Electrical and Computer Engineering and ICES. His research interests are in applications in power systems, design research and education and distributed agent problem solving.

James Garrett is a Professor of Civil Engineering, Director of the Advanced Infrastructure laboratory at ICES and the Associate Dean of the College of Engineering. His interests are in computer aided engineering, information systems in construction management and design education.

Annette Jacobson is a Senior lecturer and Director of the Colloids and Polymers Lab at the Department of Chemical Engineering. She is dedicated to bringing science education to children of all ages and her research interests are in colloids and polymers.

Chris Paredis is Research Scientist at ICES and the Department of Computer and Electrical engineering. His areas of research are robotics, composable simulation for mechatronic systems and design research.

Cristina Amon is the Raymond E. Lane Professor of Mechanical Engineering and the Director of ICES at CMU. Her Areas of research interests in the areas of thermal management for electronics and bio-medical engineering.

Paulien Herder is an Assistant professor in the Energy & Industry group at the Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. Her research interests are: engineering design, in particular chemical process design (operability, controllability, flexibility, safety); life cycle considerations in design; design process and knowledge management; and design and management of infrastructures.

Adam Turk is a post-doctoral researcher in the Industry, Energy and Environment group at the Delft University of Technology. His research interests are in design and Management of infrastructures (integrated design & control).