

**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
2005  
ENGINEERING SENIOR DESIGN  
PROJECTS TO AID PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES**



**Edited By  
John D. Enderle  
Brooke Hallowell**



**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

**2005**

**ENGINEERING SENIOR DESIGN  
PROJECTS TO AID PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES**

Edited By  
John D. Enderle  
Brooke Hallowell

Creative Learning Press, Inc.  
P.O. Box 320  
Mansfield Center, Connecticut 06250

---

This publication is funded by the National Science Foundation under grant number 0302351.  
All opinions are those of the authors.

---

---

# PUBLICATION POLICY

---

Enderle, John Denis

National Science Foundation 2005 Engineering Senior Design Projects To Aid Persons with Disabilities /  
John D. Enderle, Brooke Hallowell

Includes index

ISBN 1-931280-03-7

Copyright © 2006 by Creative Learning Press, Inc.

P.O. Box 320

Mansfield Center, Connecticut 06250

All Rights Reserved. These papers may be freely reproduced and distributed as long as the source is credited.

Printed in the United States of America

---

# CONTENTS

---

<b>PUBLICATION POLICY.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS.....</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>FOREWORD .....</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2 BEST PRACTICES IN SENIOR DESIGN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3 "MEANINGFUL" ASSESSMENT OF DESIGN EXPERIENCES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 USING NSF-SPONSORED PROJECTS TO ENRICH STUDENTS' WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5 CONNECTING STUDENTS WITH PERSONS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6 ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY.....</b>	<b>41</b>
THERAPEUTIC WRIST AND FOREARM BRACE .....	42
ADAPTOR FOR EXERCISE BICYCLE PEDAL.....	44
DEVICE FOR STRETCHING LEG MUSCLES .....	46
MOBILITY AID PROTECTIVE DEVICE .....	48
SENSORY BOX.....	50
CLUTCH REACHING AND GRIPPING DEVICE .....	52
<b>CHAPTER 7 DUKE UNIVERSITY.....</b>	<b>53</b>
FOOT-OPERATED CAMERA SYSTEM .....	54
RECREATIONAL SWING AID.....	56
OVEN HELPER .....	58
PENCIL DISPENSER AND COUNTER .....	60
MODIFIED ELECTRIC SCOOTER.....	62
ALL TERRAIN WALKER.....	64
ROTATIONAL WORKSTATION.....	66
PAPER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	68
3-D SOUND STATION.....	70
READER'S ASSISTIVE DEVICE .....	72
ASSISTIVE FOOT CARE DEVICE .....	74
ACCESSIBLE BALL MAZE.....	76
MODIFIED SCOOTER.....	78
<b>CHAPTER 8 MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY.....</b>	<b>81</b>
ACCESSIBILITY SYSTEM FOR A SCHOOL STAGE.....	82
LIFT AND TRANSPORT SYSTEM.....	84
MILK CARTON OPENER .....	86
TOOTHBRUSH ASSIST DEVICE .....	88
<b>CHAPTER 9 NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>91</b>
PORTABLE DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS ASSISTANT.....	92
CONVERSATIONAL SPEECH ASSISTANT .....	94
THERAPEUTIC HEATING ZONE SYSTEM.....	96
REMOTE DOOR ALARM .....	98

NURSE ALERT SYSTEM.....	100
PAGE-TURNING SYSTEM.....	102
VIBROTACTILE STIMULATION PAD .....	104
SHOULDER TILT INDICATOR.....	106
AMBULATORY BRAIN COMPUTER INTERFACE.....	108
PRODUCTION REPORT ASSISTANT .....	110
BOCCE BALL SCORING SYSTEM II .....	112
<b>CHAPTER 10 SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>115</b>
CENTER PEDESTAL GRINDER WITH PIVOTING BASE FOR RACING SAILBOAT.....	116
TRACK AND TROLLEY FOR RACING SAILBOAT COCKPIT CREW SEATS .....	118
<b>CHAPTER 11 STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO .....</b>	<b>121</b>
WALKER WITH A SLING/SADDLE SEAT .....	122
ADJUSTABLE SHOE GRIPPER/HELPER .....	124
AUTOMATIC PILL DISPENSER.....	126
SELF-RISING SUPPORT CANE .....	128
LEVER-OPERATED DISHWASHER OPENER .....	130
EZ-SPLIT PILL CUTTING MACHINE.....	132
MOTORIZED WEAK GRIP BED HOIST .....	134
WHEELCHAIR-MOUNTED SUCTION SYSTEM FOR RETRIEVAL OF SMALL ITEMS .....	136
BATTERY-OPERATED AUTOMATIC TOOTHPASTE DISPENSER.....	138
REMOTE CONTROL ENTRY DOOR .....	140
POWERED DESKTOP LETTER OPENER .....	142
POCKET-SIZED CHANGE SORTER.....	144
BATHTUB TRANSFER BENCH WITH ROTARY SEAT .....	146
TURN-EASE MOTORIZED REFRIGERATOR.....	148
LAZY SUSAN.....	148
EASY-STORE EASY-USE CRUTCHES .....	150
ROTATIONAL SHOWER SCALD SAFE VALVE .....	152
APPARATUS FOR REMOVAL AND TRANSPORTATION OF GARBAGE .....	154
TANGLE-FREE CPAP MASK .....	156
CANE SEAT.....	158
PAPER CURRENCY IDENTIFIER.....	160
ADJUSTABLE MECHANICAL REACHER .....	162
ADJUSTABLE SCISSOR LIFT TO MOVE A PERSON BETWEEN A WHEELCHAIR AND THE FLOOR ..	164
ONE-BUTTON INFRARED REMOTE CONTROL .....	166
TABLETOP PILL REMINDER .....	168
PORTABLE DEVICE TO LIFT A PERSON INTO A VEHICLE .....	170
QUICK AND EASY HEIGHT-ADJUSTABLE WALKER ATTACHMENT FOR FOREARM SUPPORT .....	172
E-Z REACH VERTICAL SPACE SAVER STORAGE SYSTEM.....	174
VIBRATING BRACELET .....	176
TACTILE FEEDBACK PRESSURE SENSOR WALKING DEVICE .....	178
AUTOMATIC CORD RETRACTOR FOR PORTABLE VENTILATORS .....	180
<b>CHAPTER 12 STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK.....</b>	<b>183</b>
BIKE EXERCISER .....	184
CLEANING ASSISTANT.....	186
ALTERNATELY-PROPELLED MECHANICAL WHEELCHAIR .....	188
TRICYCLE-BASED HAND-POWERED WHEELCHAIR .....	190
HILL ASSIST WHEELCHAIR WITH ENHANCED SAFETY .....	192
TIDIS-B: WHEELCHAIR-TO-BED TRANSFER SYSTEM .....	194
ELECTRICALLY-ASSISTED HUMAN-POWERED VEHICLE.....	196
SMART SHOWER.....	198
<b>CHAPTER 13 UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM.....</b>	<b>201</b>

CHEETAH WALKER: TRANSITIONAL WALKING DEVICE.....	202
ELECTRIC ELEVATION ASSIST AND SPASTICITY CONTROL ARM.....	204
SAFE FLOORS FOR PREVENTION OF FALLS .....	206
STAIR TRAINER FOR CHILDREN WITH CEREBRAL PALSY .....	208
<b>CHAPTER 14 UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST .....</b>	<b>211</b>
SPATIAL RESOLUTION ENHANCEMENT IN ULTRASONIC RANGING FOR A SMART CANE.....	212
SMART CANE MODIFICATIONS.....	214
DAMPER DEVICE TO PROTECT SMART CANE ELECTRONICS.....	216
BOTTLE CAP REMOVAL ASSISTANT.....	218
ASSISTIVE REACH MECHANISM.....	220
ASSISTIVE STAIR CLIMBER .....	222
STOW AND GO: JOHN DEERE GATOR WHEELCHAIR STORAGE SYSTEM .....	224
<b>CHAPTER 15 UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT LOWELL.....</b>	<b>227</b>
NINE-BUTTON TALKING BOX .....	228
DROP FOOT SOCK.....	230
SNOEZELEN SWITCH .....	232
HEAD-ACTIVATED WHEELCHAIR.....	234
TRANSITIONAL TIMER.....	236
NO TOUCH SWITCH.....	238
WIRELESS BASE SIGNAL FOR BEEP BASEBALL.....	240
VOICE ACTIVATED ALARM CLOCK SYSTEM.....	242
FOOT-CONTROLLABLE TEXT PROCESSOR .....	244
KEYLESSBOARD.....	246
CIRCLE TIME APPARATUS .....	248
WIRELESSLY CONTROLLED HEATED GLOVES AND SOCKS .....	250
PERFECT WORKSTATION .....	252
WHEELCHAIR SCALE .....	254
NUMBER ACTIVITY BOARD .....	256
SNOOZELLEN SWITCH .....	258
VOCAL TRAINER .....	260
LIGHT, MUSIC AND TOY BOX .....	262
JOYSTICK-CONTROLLED TILTING MIRROR.....	264
MOTION-ACTIVATED CD PLAYER.....	266
INTERACTIVE BUBBLE TUBE .....	268
SMART PILLBOX.....	270
PROGRAM TIMER .....	272
ALARM SYSTEM FOR AN AUTISTIC CHILD .....	273
<b>CHAPTER 16 UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL.....</b>	<b>275</b>
ELECTRONICALLY-ACTUATED LAZY SUSAN.....	276
FLOW-CONTROLLED SPORTS BOTTLE.....	278
ONE-HANDED NAILSET AND CHISEL .....	280
JAWS: ZIPLOC BAG MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	282
<b>CHAPTER 17 UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO.....</b>	<b>285</b>
VEHICLE CARRIER FOR A RECUMBENT TRIKE .....	286
ALL-TERRAIN WHEELCHAIR.....	292
WALKER WITH REMOVABLE TRAY .....	296
TANDEM ICE HOCKEY SLED.....	298
AIMING DEVICE AND STAND .....	300
WHEELCHAIR CAMERA STAND.....	302
EXTENSION PUSH HANDLES FOR A MANUAL WHEELCHAIR .....	304
POOL WHEELCHAIR.....	306

<b>CHAPTER 18</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MILWAUKEE .....</b>	<b>309</b>
	ACCESSIBLE WEIGHT SCALE .....	310
	ACCESSIBLE EXERCISER: HANDGRIP ASSIST .....	312
	ACCESSIBLE EXERCISER: LEG SUPPORT .....	315
	ACCESSIBLE EXERCISER: LEG SUPPORT .....	316
	TRANSFER LIFT ASSIST FOR PEOPLE WHO USE WHEELCHAIRS .....	318
<b>CHAPTER 19</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING.....</b>	<b>321</b>
	ACCESSIBLE SYRINGE DOSING DEVICE .....	322
	WHEELCHAIR/BICYCLE TANDEM ADAPTER.....	324
	HUNTING BLIND FOR PEOPLE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES.....	326
	HIGH/LOW BATH SEAT.....	328
	CHILD MONITORING SYSTEM.....	330
	POWER-ASSISTED TRICYCLE SAFETY ENHANCEMENT .....	332
	LEG-POWERED QUADCYCLE BY FOX ENGINEERING.....	336
	HANDS-FREE MOUSE.....	338
	LUNCHROOM CHAIR .....	340
	EXTENDABLE REACHER .....	342
	WHEELCHAIR PLATFORM FOR MEDICAL DEVICES .....	344
	ELECTRONIC BOARD GAME FOR CHILDREN WITH LIMITED MOBILITY .....	346
	OFF-ROAD HAND-POWERED TRIKE.....	348
<b>CHAPTER 20</b>	<b>WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>351</b>
	PACKAGING AND ASSEMBLY ENHANCEMENTS .....	352
	DISABILITY ADVOCATES AND COMMUNITY ACTION USING.....	356
	WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION’S NEW INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF FUNCTIONING, DISABILITY, AND HEALTH (ICF) .....	356
	USER INTERFACE AND ACTIVITIES FOR THE RF TAG EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES SYSTEM .....	358
	MARK MY WORDS.....	360
<b>CHAPTER 21</b>	<b>WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>363</b>
	LIGHTED CLOUD CEILING.....	364
	NURSING ALERT SYSTEM .....	368
	HAND WASHER.....	370
	AUDIO-VISUAL ALERT SYSTEM .....	372
	PAPER COLLATING MACHINE.....	374
	ADAPTED RADIO .....	376
	HEAT- AND OCCUPANCY-DETECTING SYSTEM .....	378
	ACOUSTIC VIBRATING PILLOW.....	380
<b>INDEX .....</b>		<b>383</b>



---

# CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

---

*Steven Barrett*, Electrical and Computer Engineering  
College of Engineering, P.O. Box 3295, Laramie, WY  
82071-3295

*John E. Beard*, Department of Biomedical  
Engineering, Michigan Technological University,  
1400 Townsend Drive, 312 Chemical Sciences &  
Engineering, Houghton, Michigan 49931-1295

*Laurence N. Bohs*, Department of Biomedical  
Engineering, Duke University, Durham, North  
Carolina 27708-0281

*Fu-Pen Chiang*, State University Of New York At  
Stony Brook, College of Engineering and Applied  
Sciences, Department of Mechanical Engineering,  
Stony Brook, New York 11794-2300

*Donn Clark*, Department of Electrical and Computer  
Engineering, University of Massachusetts Lowell, 1  
University Ave., Lowell, MA 01854

*Kyle Colling*, Department of Special Education  
Counseling, Reading and Early Childhood  
(SECREC), Montana State University, 1500  
University Dr., Billings, MT 59101-0298

*Kay Cowie*, Department of Special Education, The  
University of Wyoming, Mcwhinnie Hall 220,  
Laramie, WY 82071

*Alan W. Eberhardt*, University Of Alabama At  
Birmingham, Department of Materials and  
Mechanical Engineering, BEC 254, 1150 10th Ave. S.,  
Birmingham, Alabama, 35294-4461

*John Enderle*, Biomedical Engineering, University of  
Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-2157

*Robert F. Erlandson*, Wayne State University,  
Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering,  
5050 Anthony Wayne Drive, Detroit, MI 48202

*Bertram N. Ezenwa*, Department of Occupational  
Therapy, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 212  
Hartford Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53211

*Donald Fisher*, University Of Massachusetts At  
Amherst. College of Engineering, Department of

Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Engineering  
Lab, Amherst, MA 01003-3662

*Robert X. Gao*, University Of Massachusetts at  
Amherst. College of Engineering, Department of  
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Engineering  
Lab, Amherst, MA 01003-3662

*Jeffrey Q. Ge*, State University Of New York At Stony  
Brook, College of Engineering and Applied Sciences,  
Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stony  
Brook, New York 11794-2300

*Jacob S. Glower*, Department of Electrical  
Engineering, North Dakota State University, Fargo,  
North Dakota 58105

*Richard Goldberg*, Department of Biomedical  
Engineering, University Of North Carolina At  
Chapel Hill, 152 MacNider, CB #7455, Chapel Hill,  
NC 27599

*Roger A. Green*, Department of Electrical  
Engineering, North Dakota State University, Fargo,  
North Dakota 58105

*Brooke Hallowell*, College of Health and Human  
Services, W378 Grover Center, Ohio University,  
Athens, OH 45701

*Jiping He*, Dept. of Bioengineering, Arizona State  
University, Tempe, AZ 85287-9709

*Mohamed Samir Hefzy*, Department of Mechanical,  
Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering,  
University Of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, 43606-3390

*Joel A. Jorgenson*, Department of Electrical  
Engineering, North Dakota State University, Fargo,  
North Dakota 58105

*Sundar Krishnamurty*, University Of Massachusetts  
At Amherst. College of Engineering, Department of  
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Engineering  
Lab, Amherst, MA 01003-3662

*Michael A. Lambert*, Department of Mechanical  
Engineering, San Diego State University, 5500  
Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-1323

*Kathleen Laurin*, Department of Special Education Counseling, Reading and Early Childhood (SECREC), Montana State University, 1500 University Dr., Billings, MT 59101-0298

*Joseph C. Mollendorf*, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260

*David A. Nelson*, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Michigan Technological University, 1400 Townsend Drive, 312 Chemical Sciences & Engineering, Houghton, Michigan 49931-1295

*Gregory Nemunaitis*, Medical College of Ohio, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Toledo, Ohio 43614

*Karen May-Newman*, Department of Mechanical Engineering, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-1323

*Chandler Phillips*, Biomedical and Human Factors Engineering, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435

*David B. Reynolds*, Biomedical and Human Factors Engineering, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435

*Debra D. Wright*, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Michigan Technological University, 1400 Townsend Drive, 312 Chemical Sciences & Engineering, Houghton, Michigan 49931-1295

---

# FOREWORD

---

Welcome to the seventeenth annual issue of the National Science Foundation Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities. In 1988, the National Science Foundation (NSF) began a program to provide funds for student engineers at universities throughout the United States to construct custom designed devices and software for individuals with disabilities. Through the Bioengineering and Research to Aid the Disabled (BRAD) program of the Emerging Engineering Technologies Division of NSF<sup>1</sup>, funds were awarded competitively to 16 universities to pay for supplies, equipment and fabrication costs for the design projects. A book entitled NSF 1989 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid the Disabled was published in 1989, describing the projects that were funded during the first year of this effort.

In 1989, the BRAD program of the Emerging Engineering Technologies Division of NSF increased the number of universities funded to 22. Following completion of the 1989-1990 design projects, a second book describing these projects, entitled NSF 1990 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid the Disabled, was published.

North Dakota State University (NDSU) Press published the following three issues. In NSF 1991 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid the Disabled almost 150 projects by students at 20 universities across the United States during the academic year 1990-91 were described. NSF 1992 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid the Disabled presented almost 150 projects carried out by students at 21 universities across the United States during the 1991-92 academic year. The fifth issue described 91 projects by students at 21 universities across the United States during the 1992-93 academic year.

Creative Learning Press, Inc. has published the succeeding volumes. NSF 1994 Engineering Senior

---

<sup>1</sup> In January of 1994, the Directorate for Engineering (ENG) was restructured. This program is now in the Division of Bioengineering and Environmental Systems, Biomedical Engineering & Research Aiding Persons with Disabilities Program.

Design Projects to Aid the Disabled, published in 1997, described 94 projects carried out by students at 19 universities during the academic 1993-94 year. NSF 1995 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid the Disabled, published in 1998, described 124 projects carried out by students at 19 universities during the 1994-95 academic year. NSF 1996 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 1999, presented 93 projects carried out by students at 12 universities during the 1995-96 academic year. The ninth issue, NSF 1997 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2000, included 124 projects carried out by students at 19 universities during the 1996-97 academic year. NSF 1998 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2001, presented 118 projects carried out by students at 17 universities during the 1997-98 academic year. NSF 1999 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2001, presented 117 projects carried out by students at 17 universities during the 1998-99 academic year. NSF 2000 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2002, presented 127 projects carried out by students at 16 universities during the 1999-2000 academic year. In 2002, NSF 2001 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities was published, presenting 134 projects carried out by students at 19 universities during the 2000-2001 academic year. NSF 2002 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2004, presented 115 projects carried out by students at 16 universities during the 2001-2002 academic year. In 2005, NSF 2003 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities was published, presenting 134 projects carried out by students at 19 universities during the 2002-2003 academic year. NSF 2004 Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities, published in 2005, presented 173 projects carried out by students at 17 universities during the 2003-2004 academic year.

This book, funded by the NSF, describes and documents the NSF-supported senior design projects during the seventeenth year of this effort, 2004-2005. Each chapter, except for the first five, describes activity at a single university, and was

written by the principal investigator(s) at that university and revised by the editors of this publication. Individuals wishing more information on a particular design should contact the designated supervising principal investigator. An index is provided so that projects may be easily identified by topic. Chapters on best practices in design experiences, outcomes assessment, and writing about and working with individuals who have disabilities are also included in this book.

It is hoped that this book will enhance the overall quality of future senior design projects directed toward persons with disabilities by providing examples of previous projects, and by motivating faculty at other universities to participate because of the potential benefits to students, schools, and communities. Moreover, the new technologies used in these projects will provide examples in a broad range of applications for new engineers. The ultimate goal of this publication and all the projects built under this initiative is to assist individuals with disabilities in reaching their maximum potential for enjoyable and productive lives.

This NSF program has brought together individuals with widely varied backgrounds. Through the richness of their interests, a wide variety of projects has been completed and is in use. A number of different technologies were incorporated in the design projects to maximize the impact of each device on the individual for whom it was developed. A two-page project description format is generally used in this text. Each project is introduced with a nontechnical description, followed by a summary of impact that illustrates the effect of the project on an individual's life. A detailed technical description then follows. Photographs and drawings of the devices and other important components are incorporated throughout the manuscript.

Sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Allen Zelman, a former Program Director of the NSF BRAD program, for being the prime enthusiast behind this initiative. Additionally, thanks are extended to Drs. Peter G. Katona, Karen M. Mudry, Fred Bowman,

Carol Lucas, Semahat Demir and Gil Devey, former and current NSF Program Directors of the Biomedical Engineering and Research to Aid Persons with Disabilities Programs, who have continued to support and expand the program.

We acknowledge and thank Samuel Enderle for technical illustrations, and Alexandra Enderle, Nicholas Linn, Rachel Poling, Annie Puntillo, Heather Williams, and Imogene Preisch for editorial assistance. We also acknowledge and thank Ms. Shari Valenta for the cover illustration and the artwork throughout the book, drawn from her observations at the Children's Hospital Accessibility Resource Center in Denver, Colorado.

The information in this publication is not restricted in any way. Individuals are encouraged to use the project descriptions in the creation of future design projects for persons with disabilities. The NSF and editors make no representations or warranties of any kind with respect to these design projects, and specifically disclaim any liability for any incidental or consequential damages arising from the use of this publication. Faculty members using the book as a guide should exercise good judgment when advising students.

Readers familiar with previous editions of this book will note that John Enderle moved from North Dakota State University to the University of Connecticut in 1995. With that move, annual publications also moved from NDSU Press to Creative Learning Press Inc. in 1997. During 1994, Enderle also served as NSF Program Director for the Biomedical Engineering and Research Aiding Persons with Disabilities Program while on a leave of absence from NDSU. Brooke Hallowell is Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Programs in the College of Health and Human Services and Director of the School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences at Ohio University. Hallowell's primary area of expertise is in neurogenic communication disorders. She has a long history of collaboration with colleagues in biomedical engineering, in research, curriculum development, teaching, and assessment.

The editors welcome any suggestions as to how this review may be made more useful for subsequent yearly issues. Previous editions of this book are available for viewing at the web site for this project:

<http://nsf-pad.bme.uconn.edu/>.

John D. Enderle, Ph.D., Editor  
260 Glenbrook Road  
University of Connecticut  
Storrs, Connecticut 06269-2247  
Voice: (860) 486-5521; FAX: (860) 486-2500  
E-mail: [jenderle@bme.uconn.edu](mailto:jenderle@bme.uconn.edu)

Brooke Hallowell, Ph.D., Editor  
W378 Grover Center  
Ohio University  
Athens, OH 45701  
Voice: (740) 593-1356; FAX: (740) 593-0287  
E-mail: [hallowel@ohio.edu](mailto:hallowel@ohio.edu)

May 2006



**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

**2005**

**ENGINEERING SENIOR DESIGN  
PROJECTS TO AID PERSONS WITH  
DISABILITIES**





# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

*John Enderle and Brooke Hallowell*

Devices and software to aid persons with disabilities often require custom modification. They are sometimes prohibitively expensive or even nonexistent. Many persons with disabilities have limited access to current technology and custom modification of available devices. Even when available, personnel costs for engineering and support make the cost of custom modifications beyond the reach of the persons who need them.

In 1988, the National Science Foundation (NSF), through its Emerging Engineering Technologies Division, initiated a program to support student engineers at universities throughout the United States in designing and building devices for persons with disabilities. Since its inception, this NSF program (originally called Bioengineering and Research to Aid the Disabled) has enhanced educational opportunities for students and improved the quality of life for individuals with disabilities. Students and university faculty members provide, through their Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accredited senior design class, engineering time to design and build the device or software. The NSF provides funds, competitively awarded to universities for supplies, equipment and fabrication costs for the design projects.

Outside of the NSF program, students are typically involved in design projects that incorporate academic goals for solid curricular design experiences, but that do not necessarily enrich the quality of life for persons other than, perhaps, the students themselves. For instance, students might design and construct a stereo receiver, a robotic unit that performs a household chore, or a model racecar.

Under this NSF program, engineering design students are involved in projects that result in original devices, or custom modifications of devices, that improve the quality of life for persons with

disabilities. The students have opportunities for practical and creative problem solving to address well-defined needs, and persons with disabilities receive the products of that process at no financial cost. Upon completion, each finished project becomes the property of the individual for whom it was designed.

The emphases of the program are to:

- Provide children and adults with disabilities student-engineered devices or software to improve their quality of life and provide greater self-sufficiency,
- Enhance the education of student engineers through the designing and building of a device or software that meets a real need, and
- Allow participating universities an opportunity for unique service to the local community.

Local schools, clinics, health centers, sheltered workshops, hospitals, and other community agencies participate in the effort by referring interested individuals to the program. A single student or a team of students specifically designs each project for an individual or a group of individuals with a similar need. Examples of projects completed in past years include laser-pointing devices for people who cannot use their hands, speech aids, behavior modification devices, hands-free automatic telephone answering and hang-up systems, and infrared systems to help individuals who are blind navigate through indoor spaces. The students participating in this program are richly rewarded through their activity with persons with disabilities, and justly experience a unique sense of purpose and pride in their accomplishments.

### *The Current Book*

This book describes the NSF supported senior design projects during the academic year 2003-2004.

The purpose of this publication is threefold. First, it is to serve as a reference or handbook for future senior design projects. Students are exposed to this unique body of applied information on current technology in this and previous editions of this book. This provides an even broader education than typically experienced in an undergraduate curriculum, especially in the area of rehabilitation design. Many technological advances originate from work in the space, defense, entertainment, and communications industry. Few of these advances have been applied to the rehabilitation field, making the contributions of this NSF program all the more important.

Secondly, it is hoped that this publication will serve to motivate students, graduate engineers and others to work more actively in rehabilitation. This will ideally lead to an increased technology and knowledge base to effectively address the needs of persons with disabilities.

Thirdly, through its initial four chapters, the publication provides an avenue for motivating and informing all involved in design projects concerning specific means of enhancing engineering education through design experiences.

This introduction provides background material on the book and elements of design experiences. The second chapter highlights specific aspects of some exemplary practices in design projects to aid persons with disabilities. The third chapter addresses assessment of outcomes related to design projects to aid persons with disabilities. The fourth chapter provides details on enhancing students' writing skills through the senior design experience. The fifth chapter addresses the importance of fostering relationships between students and individuals with disabilities.

After the five introductory chapters, 15 chapters follow, with each chapter devoted to one participating school. At the start of each chapter, the school and the principal investigator(s) are identified. Each project description is written using the following format. On the first page, the individuals involved with the project are identified, including the student(s), the professor(s) who supervised the project, and key professionals involved in the daily lives of the individual for whom the project has been developed. A brief nontechnical description of the project follows with

a summary of how the project has improved a person's quality of life. A photograph of the device or modification is usually included. Next, a technical description of the device or modification is given, with parts specified in cases where it may be difficult to fabricate them otherwise. An approximate cost of the project, excluding personnel costs, is provided.

Most projects are described in two pages. However, the first or last project in each chapter is usually significantly longer and contains more analytic content. Individuals wishing more information on a particular design should contact the designated supervising principal investigator.

Some of the projects described are custom modifications of existing devices, modifications that would be prohibitively expensive were it not for the student engineers and this NSF program. Other projects are unique one-of-a-kind devices wholly designed and constructed by students for specific individuals.

### *Engineering Design*

As part of the accreditation process for university engineering programs, students are required to complete a minimum number of design credits in their course of study, typically at the senior level.<sup>2,3,4</sup> Many call this the capstone course. Engineering design is a course or series of courses that brings together concepts and principles that students learn in their field of study. It involves the integration and extension of material learned throughout an academic program to achieve a specific design goal. Most often, the student is

---

<sup>2</sup> Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (1999). Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual Effective for Evaluations for the 2000-2001 Accreditation Cycle. ABET: Baltimore, MD.

<sup>3</sup> Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (2000). Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET: Baltimore, MD.

<sup>4</sup> Enderle, J.D., Gassert, J., Blanchard, S.M., King, P., Beasley, D., Hale Jr., P. and Aldridge, D., The ABCs of Preparing for ABET, IEEE *EMB Magazine*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 122-132, 2003

exposed to system-wide analysis, critique and evaluation. Design is an iterative decision-making process in which the student optimally applies previously learned material to meet a stated objective.

There are two basic approaches to teaching engineering design, the traditional or discipline-dependent approach, and the holistic approach. The traditional approach involves reducing a system or problem into separate discipline-defined components. This approach minimizes the essential nature of the system as a holistic or complete unit, and often leads participants to neglect the interactions that take place between the components. The traditional approach usually involves a sequential, iterative approach to the system or problem, and emphasizes simple cause-effect relationships.

A more holistic approach to engineering design is becoming increasingly feasible with the availability of powerful computers and engineering software packages, and the integration of systems theory, which addresses interrelationships among system components as well as human factors. Rather than partitioning a project based on discipline-defined components, designers partition the project according to the emergent properties of the problem.

A design course provides opportunities for problem solving relevant to large-scale, open-ended, complex, and sometimes ill-defined systems. The emphasis of design is not on learning new material. Typically, there are no required textbooks for the design course, and only a minimal number of lectures are presented to the student. Design is best described as an individual study course where the student:

- Selects the device or system to design,
- Writes specifications,
- Creates a paper design,
- Analyzes the paper design,
- Constructs the device,
- Evaluates the device,
- Documents the design project, and
- Presents the project to a client.

### ***Project Selection***

In a typical NSF design project, the student meets with the client (a person with a disability and/or a client coordinator) to assess needs and to help identify a useful project. Often, the student meets

with many clients before finding a project for which his or her background is suitable.

After selecting a project, the student then writes a brief description of the project for approval by the faculty supervisor. Since feedback at this stage of the process is vitally important for a successful project, students usually meet with the client once again to review the project description.

Teams of students often undertake projects. One or more members of a team meet with one or more clients before selecting a project. After project selection, the project is partitioned by the team into logical parts, and each student is assigned one of these parts. Usually, a team leader is elected by the team to ensure that project goals and schedules are satisfied. A team of students generally carries out multiple projects.

Project selection is highly variable depending on the university and the local health care facilities. Some universities make use of existing technology to develop projects by accessing databases such as ABLEDATA. ABLEDATA includes information on types of assistive technology, consumer guides, manufacturer directories, commercially available devices, and one-of-a-kind customized devices. In total, this database has over 23,000 products from 2,600 manufacturers and is available from:

<http://www.abledata.com>

or

(800) 227-0216.

More information about this NSF program is available at:

<http://nsf-pad.bme.uconn.edu>

### ***Specifications***

One of the most important parts of the design process is determining the specifications, or requirements that the design project must fulfill. There are many different types of hardware and software specifications.

Prior to the design of a project, a statement as to how the device will function is required. Operational specifications are incorporated in determining the problem to be solved. Specifications are defined such that any competent engineer is able to design a device that will perform a given function. Specifications determine the

device to be built, but do not provide information about how the device is built. If several engineers design a device from the same specifications, all of the designs would perform within the given tolerances and satisfy the requirements; however, each design would be different. Manufacturers' names are generally not stated in specifications, especially for electronic or microprocessor components, so that design choices for future projects are not constrained.

If the design project involves modifying an existing device, the modification is fully described in detail. Specific components of the device, such as microprocessors, LEDs, and electronic parts, are described. Descriptive detail is appropriate because it defines the environment to which the design project must interface. However, the specifications for the modification should not provide detailed information about how the device is to be built.

Specifications are usually written in a report that qualitatively describes the project as completely as possible, and how the project will improve the life of an individual. It is also important to explain the motivation for carrying out the project. The following issues are addressed in the specifications:

- What will the finished device do?
- What is unusual about the device?

Specifications include a technical description of the device, and all of the facts and figures needed to complete the design project. The following are examples of important items included in technical specifications:

- Electrical parameters (including interfaces, voltages, impedances, gains, power output, power input, ranges, current capabilities, harmonic distortion, stability, accuracy, precision, and power consumption)
- Mechanical parameters (including size, weight, durability, accuracy, precision, and vibration)
- Environmental parameters (including location, temperature range, moisture, and dust)

#### ***Paper Design and Analysis***

The next phase of the design is the generation of possible solutions to the problem based on the specifications, and selection of an optimal solution. This involves creating a paper design for each of the solutions and evaluating performance based on the specifications. Since design projects are open-ended,

many solutions exist, solutions that often require a multidisciplinary system or holistic approach for a successful and useful product. This stage of the design process is typically the most challenging because of the creative aspect to generating problem solutions.

The specifications previously described are the criteria for selecting the best design solution. In many projects, some specifications are more important than others, and trade-offs between specifications may be necessary. In fact, it may be impossible to design a project that satisfies all of the design specifications. Specifications that involve some degree of flexibility are helpful in reducing the overall complexity, cost and effort in carrying out the project. Some specifications are absolute and cannot be relaxed.

Most projects are designed in a top-down approach similar to the approach of writing computer software by first starting with a flow chart. After the flow chart or block diagram is complete, the next step involves providing additional details to each block in the flow chart. This continues until sufficient detail exists to determine whether the design meets the specifications after evaluation.

To select the optimal design, it is necessary to analyze and evaluate the possible solutions. For ease in analysis, it is usually easiest to use computer software. For example, PSpice, a circuit analysis program, easily analyzes circuit problems. Other situations require that a potential design project solution be partially constructed or breadboarded for analysis and evaluation. After analysis of all possible solutions, the optimal design selected is the one that meets the specifications most closely.

#### ***Construction and Evaluation of the Device***

After selecting the optimal design, the student then constructs the device. The best method of construction is often to build the device module by module. By building the project in this fashion, the student is able to test each module for correct operation before adding it to the complete device. It is far easier to eliminate problems module by module than to build the entire project and then attempt to eliminate problems.

Design projects are analyzed and constructed with safety as one of the highest priorities. Clearly, the design project that fails should fail in a safe manner,

without any dramatic and harmful outcomes to the client or those nearby. An example of a fail-safe mode of operation for an electrical device involves grounding the chassis, and using appropriate fuses; if ever a 120-V line voltage short circuit to the chassis should develop, a fuse would blow and no harm to the client would occur. Devices should also be protected against runaway conditions during the operation of the device and during periods of rest. Failure of any critical components in a device should result in the complete shutdown of the device.

After the project has undergone laboratory testing, it is then tested in the field with the client. After the field test, modifications are made to the project, and then the project is given to the client. Ideally, the project in use by the client should be periodically evaluated for performance and usefulness after the project is complete. Evaluation typically occurs, however, when the device no longer performs adequately for the client, and is returned to the university for repair or modification. If the repair or modification is simple, a university technician may handle the problem. If the repair or modification is more extensive, another design student may be assigned to the project to handle the problem as part of his or her design course requirements.

### ***Documentation***

Throughout the design process, the student is required to document the optimal or best solution to the problem through a series of written assignments. For the final report, documenting the design project involves integrating each of the required reports into a single final document. While this should be a simple exercise, it is often a most vexing and difficult endeavor. Many times during the final stages of the project, some specifications are changed, or extensive modifications to the ideal paper design are necessary.

Most universities require that the final report be professionally prepared using desktop publishing software. This requires that all circuit diagrams and mechanical drawings be professionally drawn. Illustrations are usually drawn with computer software, such as OrCAD or AutoCAD.

The two-page reports within this publication are not representative of the final reports submitted for design course credit, and in fact, are summaries of the final reports. A typical final report for a design project is approximately 30 pages in length, and includes extensive analysis supporting the operation of the design project. Usually, photographs of the device are not included in the final report since mechanical and electrical diagrams are more useful to the engineer to document the device.



# CHAPTER 2

## BEST PRACTICES IN SENIOR DESIGN

*John Enderle and Brooke Hallowell*

This chapter presents different approaches to the design course experience. For example, at Texas A&M University, the students work on many small design projects during the two-semester senior design course sequence. At North Dakota State University, students work on a single project during the two-semester senior design course sequence. At the University of Connecticut, students are involved in a web-based approach and in distance learning, in a collaborative arrangement with Ohio University.

### **Duke University**

The Devices for the Persons with Disabilities course is offered as an elective to seniors and graduate students through the Biomedical Engineering Department at Duke University. The course has been supported since September 1996 by a grant from the National Science Foundation, and is offered each fall. The course size is limited to 12 students and four to six projects to provide a team atmosphere and to ensure quality results.

The course involves design, construction and delivery of a custom assistive technology device, typically in one semester. At the start of the semester, students are given a list of descriptions for several possible projects that have been suggested by persons with disabilities and health care workers in the local community. Students individually rank order the list, and for their top three selections describe why they are interested and what skills they possess that will help them be successful. Projects are assigned to teams of one to three students based on these interests and expected project difficulty. Soon thereafter, students meet with the project's supervisor and client. The supervisor is a health care professional, typically a speech-language pathologist or occupational or physical therapist, who has worked with the client. Student teams then formulate a plan for the project, and present an oral and written project proposal to define the problem and their expected approach. In the written proposal, results of a patent and product

search for ideas related to the student project are summarized and contrasted with the project.

Each student keeps an individual laboratory notebook for his or her project. Copies of recent entries are turned in to the course instructor for a weekly assessment of progress. During the semester, students meet regularly with the supervisor and/or client to insure that the project will be safe and meet the needs of the client. Three oral and written project reports are presented to demonstrate progress, to provide experience with engineering communications, and to allow a public forum for students to receive feedback from other students, supervisors, engineers, and health care professionals.

Course lectures are focused on basic principles of engineering design, oral and written communication, and ethics. In addition, guest lectures cover topics such as an overview of assistive technology, universal design, ergonomics and patent issues. Field trips to a local assistive technology lending library, and to an annual exposition of commercial assistive technology companies, provide further exposure to the field.

Students present their projects in near-final form at a public mock delivery two weeks before their final delivery, which provides a last chance to respond to external feedback. Final oral presentations include project demonstrations. Each project's final written report includes a quantitative analysis of the design, as well as complete mechanical drawings and schematics. At the end of the semester, students deliver their completed project to the client, along with a user's manual that describes the operation, features, and specifications for the device.

For projects requiring work beyond one semester, students may continue working through the spring semester on an independent study basis. A full-time

summer student provides service on projects already delivered.

## University of Massachusetts-Lowell

The capstone design experience at University of Mass-Lowell is divided into two three-credit courses. These courses are taken in the last two semesters of undergraduate studies and for the most part involve the design of assistive technology devices and systems. The program costs are supported in part by a five-year grant from the National Science Foundation. Additional funding comes from corporate and individual donations to the assistive technology program at University of Mass-Lowell. Both courses are presented in each semester of a traditional academic year. The combined enrollment averages between 40 and 50 each semester.

The major objective of the first course is for each student to define a major design to be accomplished prior to graduation and ideally within the timeframe of the second course. The process for choosing a design project begins immediately. However, there are other activities that take place concurrently with the search for a project. The most significant of these is a team effort to generate a business plan for securing venture capital or other forms of financing to support corporate development of a product oriented towards the disadvantaged community. The instructor chooses a number of students to serve as CEOs of their company. The remaining students must present oral and written resumes and participate in interviews.

The CEO of each company must then hire his/her employees and the teams are thus formed. Each team is expected to do the following:

- Determine a product,
- Name the company,
- Determine the process for company name registration,
- Generate a market analysis,
- Determine the patent process,
- Generate a cost analysis for an employee benefit package,
- Generate information on such terms as FICA, FUTA, SS, 941, MC, IRA, SRA, I9, and other terms relative to payroll deductions and state and federal reporting requirements,
- Meet with patent attorneys, real estate agents, members of the business community, bankers, and a venture capitalist,

- Demonstrate understanding of the cost of insurance and meet with insurance agents to discuss health and life insurance for employees and liability insurance costs for the company, and
- Explore OSHA requirements relative to setting up development laboratories.

Students carry out these tasks using direct person-to-person contact and the vast amount of information on the Internet.

The teams are also required to understand the elements of scheduling and must produce a Gant chart indicating the tasks and allotted times to take their product through development and make ready for manufacture. A cost analysis of the process is required, and students are expected to understand the real cost of development, with overhead items clearly indicated.

Much of the subject material described above is covered in daily classroom discussions and with guest speakers. During the process of generating the team business plan, each team is required to present two oral reports to the class. The first is a company report describing their company, assigned tasks, their product, and a rationale for choosing their product.

The second is a final report that is essentially a presentation of the company business plan. Technical oral and written reports are essential components of the first course. Two lectures are presented on the techniques of oral presentations and written reports are reviewed by the college technical writing consultants. All oral presentation must be made using PowerPoint or other advanced creative tools.

Early in the course, potential capstone projects are presented; students are required to review current and past projects. In some semesters, potential clients address the class. Representatives from agencies have presented their desires and individuals in wheelchairs have presented their requests to the class. Students are required to begin the process of choosing a project by meeting with potential clients and assessing the problem, defining the needs, and making a decision as to whether or not they want the associated project. In some cases, students interview and discuss as many as three or four potential projects before finding one they feel confident in accomplishing. If the project is too



complex for a single student, a team is formed. The decision to form a team is made by the instructor only after in-depth discussions with potential team members. Individual responsibilities must be identified as part of a team approach to design. Once a project has been chosen, the student must begin the process of generating a written technical proposal. This document must clearly indicate answers to the following questions:

- What are the project and its technical specifications?
- Why is the project necessary?
- What technical approach is to be used to accomplish the project?
- How much time is necessary?
- How much will the project cost?

The final activity in this first course is the oral presentation of the proposal.

The second course is concerned with the design of the project chosen and presented in the first course. In the process of accomplishing the design, students must present a total of five written progress reports, have outside contacts with a minimum of five different persons, and generate at least three publications or public presentations concerning their project. Finally, they demonstrate their project to the faculty, write a final comprehensive technical report, and deliver the project to their client.

## Texas A&M University

The objective of the NSF program at Texas A&M University is to provide senior bioengineering students an experience in the design and development of rehabilitation devices and equipment to meet explicit client needs identified at several off-campus rehabilitation and education facilities. Texas A&M has participated in the NSF program for seven years. The students meet with therapists and/or special education teachers for problem definition under faculty supervision. This program provides significant "real world" design experiences, emphasizing completion of a finished product. Moreover, the program brings needed technical expertise that would otherwise not be available to not-for-profit rehabilitation service providers. Additional benefits to the participating students include a heightened appreciation of the problems of persons with disabilities, motivation toward rehabilitation engineering as a career path, and recognition of the need for more long-term

research to address the problems for which today's designs are only an incomplete solution.

Texas A&M University's program involves a two-course capstone design sequence, BIEN 441 and 442. BIEN 441 is offered during the fall and summer semesters, and BIEN 442 is offered during the spring semester. The inclusion of the summer term allows a full year of ongoing design activities. Students are allowed to select a rehabilitation design project, or another general bioengineering design project.

The faculty members at Texas A&M University involved with the rehabilitation design course have worked in collaboration with the local school districts, community rehabilitation centers, residential units of the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR), community outreach programs of Texas MHMR, and individual clients of the Texas Rehabilitation Commission and the Texas Commission for the Blind. Appropriate design projects are identified in group meetings between the staff of the collaborating agency, the faculty, and the participating undergraduate students enrolled in the design class. In addition, one student is employed in the design laboratory during the summer to provide logistical support, and pursue his or her own project. Each student is required to participate in the project definition session, which adds to the overall design experience. The meetings take place at the beginning of each semester, and periodically thereafter as projects are completed and new ones identified.

The needs expressed by the collaborating agencies often result in projects that vary in complexity and duration. To meet the broad spectrum of needs, simpler projects are accommodated by requiring rapid completion, at which point the students move on to another project. More difficult projects involve one or more semesters, or even a year's effort; these projects are the ones that typically require more substantial quantitative and related engineering analysis.

Following the project definition, the students proceed through the formal design process of brainstorming, clarification of specifications, preliminary design, review with the collaborating agency, design execution and safety analysis, documentation, prerelease design review, and delivery and implementation in the field. The

execution phase of the design includes identifying and purchasing necessary components and materials, arranging for any fabrication services that may be necessary, and obtaining photography for their project reports.

Throughout each phase of the project, a faculty member supervises the work, as well as the teaching assistants assigned to the rehabilitation engineering laboratory. These teaching assistants are paid with university funds. The students also have continued access to the agency staff for clarification or revision of project definitions, and review of preliminary designs. The latter is an important aspect of meeting real needs with useful devices. The design team meets as a group to discuss design ideas and project progress, and to plan further visits to the agencies.

One challenging aspect of having students responsible for projects that are eagerly anticipated by the intended recipient is the variable quality of student work, and the inappropriateness of sending inadequate projects into the field. This potential problem is resolved at Texas A&M University by continuous project review, and by requiring that the projects be revised and reworked until they meet faculty approval.

At the end of each academic year, the faculty member and the personnel from each collaborating agency assess which types of projects met with the greatest success in achieving useful delivered devices. This review has provided ongoing guidance in the selection of future projects. The faculty members also maintain continuous contact with agency personnel with respect to ongoing and past projects that require repair or modification. In some instances, repairs are assigned as short-term projects to currently participating students. This provides excellent lessons in the importance of adequate documentation.

Feedback from participating students is gathered each semester using the Texas A&M University student "opinionnaire" form as well as personal discussion. The objective of the reviews is to obtain students' assessment of the educational value of the rehabilitation design program, the adequacy of the resources and supervision, and any suggestions for improving the process.

## **North Dakota State University**

North Dakota State University (NDSU) has participated in this program for ten years. All senior electrical engineering students at NDSU are required to complete a two-semester senior design project as part of their study. These students are partitioned into faculty-supervised teams of four to six students. Each team designs and builds a device for a particular disabled individual within eastern North Dakota or western Minnesota.

During the early stages of NDSU's participation in projects to aid persons with disabilities, a major effort was undertaken to develop a complete and workable interface between the NDSU electrical engineering department and the community of persons with disabilities to identify potential projects. These organizations are the Fargo Public School System, NDSU Student Services and the Anne Carlson School. NDSU students visit potential clients or their supervisors to identify possible design projects at one of the cooperating organizations. All of the senior design students visit one of these organizations at least once. After the site visit, the students write a report on at least one potential design project, and each team selects a project to aid a particular individual.

The process of a design project is implemented in two parts. During the first semester of the senior year, each team writes a report describing the project to aid an individual. Each report consists of an introduction, establishing the need for the project. The body of the report describes the device; a complete and detailed engineering analysis is included to establish that the device has the potential to work. Almost all of the NDSU projects involve an electronic circuit. Typically, devices that involve an electrical circuit are analyzed using PSpice, or another software analysis program. Extensive testing is undertaken on subsystem components using breadboard circuit layouts to ensure a reasonable degree of success before writing the report. Circuits are drawn for the report using OrCAD, a CAD program. The OrCAD drawings are also used in the second phase of design, which allows the students to bring a circuit from the schematic to a printed circuit board with relative ease.

During the second semester of the senior year, each team builds the device to aid an individual. This first involves breadboarding the entire circuit to

establish the viability of the design. After verification, the students build printed circuit boards using OrCAD, and then finish the construction of the projects using the fabrication facility in the electrical engineering department. The device is then fully tested, and after approval by the senior design faculty advisor, the device is given to the client. Each of the student design teams receives feedback throughout the year from the client or client coordinator to ensure that the design meets its intended goal.

Each design team provides an oral presentation during regularly held seminars in the department. In the past, local TV stations have filmed the demonstration of the senior design projects, and broadcast the tape on their news show. This media exposure usually results in viewers contacting the electrical engineering department with requests for projects to improve the life of another individual, further expanding the impact of the program.

Design facilities are provided in three separate laboratories for analysis, prototyping, testing, printed circuit board layout, fabrication, and redesign/development. The first laboratory is a room for team meetings during the initial stages of the design. Data books and other resources are available in this room. There are also 12 workstations available for teams to test their designs, and verify that the design parameters have been met. These workstations consist of a power supply, waveform generator, oscilloscope, breadboard, and a collection of hand tools.

The second laboratory contains Intel computers for analysis, desktop publishing and microprocessor testing. The computers all have analysis, CAD and desktop publishing capabilities so that students may easily bring their design projects from the idea to implementation stage. Analysis software supported includes Microsoft EXCEL and Lotus 123 spreadsheets, PSpice, MATLAB, MATHCAD, and VisSim. Desktop publishing supported includes Microsoft Word for Windows, Aldus PageMaker, and technical illustration software via AutoCAD and OrCAD. A scanner with image enhancement software and a high-resolution printer are also available in the laboratory.

The third laboratory is used by the teams for fabrication. Six workstations exist for breadboard testing, soldering, and finish work involving printed

circuit boards. Sufficient countertop space exists so that teams may leave their projects in a secure location for ease of work.

The electrical engineering department maintains a relatively complete inventory of electronic components necessary for design projects, and when not in stock, has the ability to order parts with minimal delay. The department also has a teaching assistant assigned to this course on a year round basis, and an electronics technician available for help in the analysis and construction of the design project.

There were many projects constructed at NDSU (and probably at many other universities) that proved to be unsafe or otherwise unusable for the intended individual, despite the best efforts of the student teams under the supervision of the faculty advisors. These projects are not officially documented.

## University of Connecticut

In August 1998 the Department of Electrical & Systems Engineering (ESE) at the University of Connecticut (UConn), in collaboration with the School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences at Ohio University, received a five-year NSF grant for senior design experiences to aid persons with disabilities. An additional five-year grant was awarded in 2005. These NSF projects are a pronounced change from previous design experiences at UConn, which involved industry sponsored projects carried out by a team of student engineers. The new Biomedical Engineering Program at UConn has now replaced the ESE Dept. in this effort.

To provide effective communication between the sponsor and the student teams, a web-based approach was implemented.<sup>5</sup> Under the new scenario, students work individually on a project and are divided into teams for weekly meetings. The purpose of the team is to provide student-derived technical support at weekly meetings. Teams also form throughout the semester based on needs to solve technical problems. After the

---

<sup>5</sup> Enderle, J.D., Browne, A.F., and Hallowell, B. (1998). A WEB Based Approach in Biomedical Engineering Design Education. *Biomedical Sciences Instrumentation*, 34, pp. 281-286.

problem is solved, the team dissolves and new teams are formed.

Each year, 25 projects are carried out by the students at UConn. Five of the 25 projects are completed through collaboration with personnel at Ohio University using varied means of communication currently seen in industry, including video conferencing, the Internet, telephone, e-mail, postal mailings, and videotapes.

Senior design consists of two required courses, Design I and II. Design I is a three-credit hour course in which students are introduced to a variety of subjects. These include: working in teams, design process, planning and scheduling (timelines), technical report writing, proposal writing, oral presentations, ethics in design, safety, liability, impact of economic constraints, environmental considerations, manufacturing, and marketing. Each student in Design I:

- Selects a project to aid a disabled individual after interviewing a person with disabilities,
- Drafts specifications,
- Prepares a project proposal,
- Selects an optimal solution and carries out a feasibility study,
- Specifies components, conducts a cost analysis and creates a time-line, and
- Creates a paper design with extensive modeling and computer analysis.

Design II is a three-credit hour course following Design I. This course requires students to implement a design by completing a working model of the final product. Prototype testing of the paper design typically requires modification to meet specifications. These modifications undergo proof of design using commercial software programs commonly used in industry. Each student in Design II:

- Constructs and tests a prototype using modular components as appropriate,
- Conducts system integration and testing,
- Assembles a final product and field-tests the device,
- Writes a final project report,
- Presents an oral report using PowerPoint on Senior Design Day, and
- Gives the device to the client after a waiver is signed.

Course descriptions, student project homepages and additional resources are located at <http://design.bme.uconn.edu/>.

The first phase of the on-campus projects involves creating a database of persons with disabilities and then linking the student with a person who has a disability. The A.J. Pappanikou Center provided an MS Access database with almost 60 contacts and a short description of disabilities associated with the clients in each. The involvement of the Center was essential for the success of the program. The A.J. Pappanikou Center is Connecticut's University Affiliated Program (UAP) for disabilities studies. As such, relationships have been established with the Connecticut community of persons affected by disabilities, including families, caregivers, advocacy and support groups and, of course, persons with disabilities themselves. The Center serves as the link between the person in need of the device and the Design course staff. The Center has established ongoing relationships with Connecticut's Regional Educational Service Centers, the Birth to Three Network, the Connecticut Tech Act Project, and the Department of Mental Retardation. Through these contacts, the Center facilitates the interaction between the ESE students, the client coordinators (professionals providing support services, such as the speech-language pathologists, physical and occupational therapists), individuals with disabilities (clients), and clients' families.

The next phase of the course involves students' selection of projects. Using the on-campus database, each student selects two clients to interview. The student and a UConn staff member meet with the client and/or client coordinator to identify a project that would improve the quality of life for the client. After the interview, the student writes a brief description for each project. Almost all of the clients interviewed have multiple projects. Project descriptions include: contact information (client, client coordinator, and student name) and a short paragraph describing the problem. These reports are collected, sorted by topic area, and put into a Project Notebook. In the future, these projects will be stored in a database accessible from the course server for ease in communication.

Each student then selects a project from a client that he or she has visited, or from the Project Notebook. If the project selected was from the Project Notebook, the student visits the client to further

refine the project. Because some projects do not involve a full academic year to complete, some students work on multiple projects. Students submit a project statement that describes the problem, including a statement of need, basic preliminary requirements, basic limitations, other data accumulated, and important unresolved questions.

Specific projects at Ohio University are established via distance communication with the co-principal investigator, who consults with a wide array of service providers and potential clients in the Athens, Ohio region.

The stages of specification, project proposal, paper design and analysis, construction and evaluation, and documentation are carried out as described earlier in the overview of engineering design.

To facilitate working with sponsors, a web-based approach is used for reporting the progress on projects. Students are responsible for creating their own Internet sites that support both html and pdf formats with the following elements:

- Introduction for the layperson,
- Resume,
- Weekly reports,
- Project statement,
- Specifications,
- Proposal, and
- Final Report.

### **Teamwork**

Student learning styles differ among team members. Gender, cultural factors, personality type, intelligence, previous educational background, academic achievement, and previous experience in teams may influence the strengths and weaknesses that individuals bring to team membership. Research pertaining to differences in cognitive style characterized by field dependence versus independence helps to shed light on individual differences among team members and how those differences may affect team interactions<sup>6,7</sup>. There is

---

<sup>6</sup> Tinajero, C., & Paramo, M. F. (1997). Field dependence-independence and academic achievement: A re-examination of their relationship. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 2, 199-212.

strong empirical evidence in numerous disciplines suggesting that students may benefit from explicit training to compensate for or enhance the cognitive style with which they enter an educational experience, such as a senior design course.<sup>8,9,10</sup>

Research on effective teamwork suggests that key variables that should be attended to for optimal team performance include:

- Explicit sharing of the group's purpose among all team members,
- Concerted orientation to a common task,
- Positive rapport among team members,
- Responsiveness to change,
- Effective conflict management,
- Effective time management, and
- Reception and use of ongoing constructive feedback.

According to the literature on cooperative learning in academic contexts,<sup>11,12</sup> the two most essential determiners for success in teamwork are positive interdependence and individual accountability.

---

<sup>7</sup> Witkin, H.A., & Goodenough, D.R. (1981). *Cognitive Styles: Essence and Origins*. International Universities Press, Inc., NY.

<sup>8</sup> Deming, W. (1986). *Out of the crisis: quality, productivity, and competitive position*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>9</sup> Katzenbach, J. & Smith, D. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: creating the high-performance organization*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

<sup>10</sup> Larson, C. & LaFasto, F. (1989). *Teamwork: what must go right, what can go wrong*. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications.

<sup>11</sup> Cottell, P.G. & Millis, B.J. (1994). Complex cooperative learning structures for college and university courses. In *To improve the Academy: Resources for students, faculty, and institutional development*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

<sup>12</sup> Jaques, D. (1991). *Learning in groups*, 2nd edition. Guilford, Surrey, England: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Positive interdependence, or effective synergy among team members, leads to a final project or design that is better than any of the individual team members may have created alone. Individual accountability, or an equal sharing of workload, ensures that no team member is overburdened and also that every team member has an equal learning opportunity and hands-on experience.

Because students are motivated to work and learn according the way they expect to be assessed, grading of specific teamwork skills of teams and of individual students inspires teams' and individuals' investment in targeted learning outcomes associated with teamwork. Teamwork assessment instruments have been developed in numerous academic disciplines and can be readily adapted for use in engineering design projects.

Clearly targeting and assessing teamwork qualities may help to alleviate conflicts among team members. In general, most team members are dedicated to the goals of the project and excel beyond all expectations. When there is a breakdown in team synergy, instructors may sometimes be effective in facilitating conflict resolution.

Timeline development by the team is vital to success, eliminates most management issues, and allows the instructor to monitor the activities by student team members. Activities for each week must be documented for each team member, with an optimal target of five to 10 activities per team member each week. When each team member knows what specific steps must be accomplished there is a greater chance of success in completing the project.

### *History of Teams in Senior Design at UConn*

#### **Projects Before the NSF Program**

Before the NSF-sponsored program, senior design was sponsored by local industry. During these years, all of the students were partitioned into four-member teams whereby student names were selected at random to choose a particular sponsored project. The projects were complex. Team members were challenged to achieve success. All of the students met each week at a team meeting with the instructor. During the first semester, lectures on teaming and communication skills were given, as well as team skills training. No timelines were used and general project goals were discussed throughout

the two semesters. A teaching assistant was used in the course as an assistant coach to help the students in whatever manner was necessary. In general, multidisciplinary teams were not formed since the student backgrounds were not the criteria used to select team members.

Procrastination, a lack of enthusiasm and poor planning were common themes among the students. Most teams encountered significant difficulties in completing projects on time. Conflict among team members was more frequent than desired, and in some extreme encounters, physical violence was threatened during lab sessions. Many students complained that the projects were far too difficult, scheduling of team meetings was too challenging, they did not have the proper background, they had difficulty communicating ideas and plans among team members, and they did not have enough time with outside activities and courses. A peer evaluation was used without success.

#### **NSF Projects Year 1**

During year one of the NSF senior design program, students worked individually on a project and were divided into teams for weekly meetings. The level of project difficulty was higher than previous years. The purpose of the team was to provide student-derived technical support at weekly team meetings. Students were also exposed to communication skills training during the weekly team meetings, and received feedback on their presentations. In addition, timelines were used for the first time, which resulted in greater harmony and success. The course improved relative to previous years. Many students continued working on their projects after the semester ended.

Throughout the year, students also divided themselves into dynamic teams apart from their regular teams based on needs. For example, students implementing a motor control project gathered together to discuss various alternatives and help each other. These same students would then join other dynamic teams in which a different technology need was evident. Dynamic teams were formed and ended during the semester. Both the regular team and dynamic teams were very important in the success of the projects.

Overall, students were enthusiastic about the working environment and the approach. Although students seemed content with being concerned only

with their individual accomplishments, completing a project according to specifications and on time, this approach lacked the important and enriching multidisciplinary team experience that is desired by industry.

### NSF Projects Year 2

During the second year of the NSF senior design program, seven students worked in two- and three-person team projects, and the remaining students in the class worked in teams oriented around a client; that is, a single client would have three students working on individual projects, projects that required integration in the same way a music system requires integration of speakers, a receiver, an amplifier, CD player, etc. In general, when teams were formed, the instructor would facilitate the teams' multidisciplinary nature. Two teams involved mechanical engineering students and electrical engineering students. The others were confined by the homogeneity of the remaining students. All of the students met each week at a team meeting with the same expectations as previously described, including oral and written reports. Dynamic teaming occurred often throughout the semester.

While the team interaction was significantly improved relative to previous semesters, the process was not ideal. Senior Design is an extremely challenging set of courses. Including additional skill development with the expectation of success in a demanding project does not always appear to be reasonable. A far better approach would be to introduce team skills much earlier in the curriculum, even as early as the freshman year. Introducing teamwork concepts and skills earlier and throughout the curriculum would ensure an improved focus on the project itself during the senior design experience.

### Timelines

At the beginning of the second semester, the student is required to update the timeline to conform to typical project management routines wherein the student focuses on concurrent activities and maps areas where project downtimes can be minimized. This updated timeline is posted on a student project web page and a hard copy is also attached to the student's workbench. This allows the professor or instructor to gauge progress and to determine




Figure 2.1. Shown above is a section of a typical timeline. The rectangular boxes represent certain tasks to be completed. These singular tasks are grouped into larger tasks, represented by thick black lines. The tasks are numbered to correspond to a task list that is not shown. The thin lines that descend from task to task are the links. Notice that task 42 must be completed before task 43 can be started. Also, task 45 must be completed before task 46 and 50 can be started. However, task 46 and 50 are concurrent, along with task 47, and can therefore be completed at the same time. No link from task 47 shows that it is out of the critical path.

whether the student is falling behind at a rate that will delay completion of the project.

Also during the second semester, the student is required to report via the web on a weekly basis project progress. Included in this report are sections of their timeline that focus on the week just past and on the week ahead. During these meetings the instructor can discuss progress or the lack thereof, but more importantly the instructor can take mental note of how the student is proceeding on a week-by-week basis.

### Theory

The Senior Design Lab utilizes what is perhaps the most easily understood project-planning tool: the timeline. The timeline, or Gantt chart (see Figure 2.1), displays each task as a horizontal line that shows the starting and ending date for each task within a project and how it relates to others.

The relation of one task to another is the central part of a timeline. The student lists tasks and assigns durations to them. The student then "links" these tasks together. Linking is done in the order of what

needs to happen first before something else can happen. These links are known as dependencies. An example of this is a construction project. The foundation must be poured before you can start to erect the walls. Once all dependencies are determined, the end date of the project can be determined. This line of linked dependencies is also known as the critical path.

The critical path, the series of tasks in a project that must be completed on time for the overall project to stay on time, can be examined and revised to advance the project completion date. If after linking tasks the timeline does not result in the required or desired completion date, it is recast. For example, sequential activities may be arranged to run in parallel, that is, concurrently to the critical path whenever this is practicable. An example of this is performing certain types of design work on sub-assembly B while injection mold parts are being manufactured for item A, which is in the critical path. In the case of the Senior Design Lab, the student would schedule report writing or familiarization of certain software packages or equipment concurrently with parts delivery or parts construction. Parallel planning prevents downtime – time is utilized to its fullest since work is always underway. The project completion date is also advanced when assigned durations of critical path tasks are altered. Concurrent tasks should be clearly delineated in the timeline for each project.

It is the planning and mapping of concurrent tasks that make the timeline a project-planning tool. In the modern working world time is a most valuable resource. The timeline facilitates time loading (resource management) by helping the project manager schedule people and resources most efficiently. For example, optimum time loading keeps a machining center from being overloaded one day and then having zero work the next day. The timeline schedules “full time busy” for people and equipment allowing for maximum pay-off and efficiency. In the machining center example, less than optimum time loading would delay any tasks that require usage of the center because a greater number of tasks are assigned than can be accomplished in the amount of time scheduled. Tasks would slide, resulting in delayed projects. The same idea of time loading is also applied to personnel resources. Less than optimal time loading could result in absurd schedules that require

employees to work excessive hours to maintain project schedules.

A timeline also allows for updates in the project plan should a task require more time than expected or if a design methodology turns out to be unsatisfactory with the result of new tasks being added. These extra times or new tasks that outline the new design track are logged into the timeline with the project completion date being altered. From this information, the project manager can either alter durations of simpler tasks or make certain tasks parallel to place the new completion date within requirements.

The timeline also acts as a communication tool. Team members or advisors can see how delays will affect the completion date or other tasks in the project. Project progress is also tracked with a timeline. The project manager can see if the tasks are completed on time or measure the delay if one is present. Alterations to amount of resources or time spent on tasks are implemented to bring the project plan back on schedule. Alterations are also made by removing certain tasks out of the critical path and placing them into a parallel path, if practical.

One major advantage of successful project planning using the timeline is the elimination of uncertainty. A detailed timeline has all project tasks thought out and listed. This minimizes the risk of missing an important task. A thoughtfully linked timeline also allows the manager to see what tasks must be completed before its dependent task can start. If schedule lag is noticed, more resources can be placed on the higher tasks.

### Method

Discussed below is a method in which a timeline can be drawn. The Senior Design Lab utilizes Microsoft Project for project planning. Aspects such as assigning work times, workday durations, etc. are determined at this time but are beyond the scope of this chapter.

Tasks are first listed in major groups. Major groupings are anything that is convenient to the project. Major groups consist of the design and/or manufacture of major components, design type (EE, ME or programming), departmental tasks, or any number of related tasks. After the major groups are listed, they are broken down into sub-tasks. If the major group is a certain type of component, say an electro-mechanical device, then related electrical or



mechanical engineering tasks required to design or build the item in the major group are listed as sub-groups. In the sub-groups the singular tasks themselves are delineated. All of the aforementioned groups, sub-groups, and tasks are listed on the left side of the timeline without regard to start, completion, or duration times. It is in this exercise where the project planner lists all of the steps required to complete a project. This task list should be detailed as highly as possible – higher detail allowing the project manager to follow the plan with greater ease.

The desired detail is determined by the requirements of the project. Some projects require week-by-week detail; other projects require that all resource movements be planned. It is also useful to schedule design reviews and re-engineering time if a design or component does not meet initial specifications as set out at project inception. Testing of designs or component parts should also be scheduled.

The second step followed in timeline drawing is the assignment of task duration. The project planner assigns time duration to each task, usually in increments of days or fractions thereof. If, for example, a task is the manufacturing of a PC Board (without soldering of components), the planner may assign a half-day to that task. All durations are assigned without regard to linking.

The next step is task linking. Here the planner determines the order in which tasks must be completed. Microsoft Project allows linking with simple keyboard commands. The planner links all tasks together, with a final completion date being noted. It is in this step where the planner must make certain decisions in order to schedule a satisfactory completion date. Tasks may be altered with respect to their duration or scheduled as concurrent items. The critical path is also delineated during the linking exercise. Once a satisfactory completion date has been scheduled due to these alterations, the planner can then publish his/her timeline and proceed to follow their work plan.

### ***Weekly Schedule***

Weekly activities in Design I consist of lectures, student presentations and a team meeting with the instructor. Technical and non-technical issues that impact the design project are discussed during team meetings. Students also meet with

clients/coordinators at scheduled times to report on progress.

Each student is expected to provide an oral progress report on his or her activity at the weekly team meeting with the instructor, and record weekly progress in a bound notebook as well as on the web site. Weekly report structure for the web page includes: project identity, work completed during the past week, current work within the last day, future work, status review, and at least one graphic. The client and/or client coordinator uses the web reports to keep up with the project so that they can provide input on the progress. Weekly activities in Design II include team meetings with the course instructor, oral and written progress reports, and construction of the project. As before, the WEB is used to report project progress and communicate with the sponsors. For the past two years, the student projects have been presented at the annual Northeast Biomedical Engineering Conference.

## **Other Engineering Design Experiences**

Experiences at other universities participating in this NSF program combine many of the design program elements presented here. Still, each university's program is unique. In addition to the design process elements already described, the program at the State University of New York at Buffalo, under the direction of Dr. Joseph Mollendorf, requires that each student go through the preliminary stages of a patent application. Naturally, projects worthy of a patent application are actually submitted. Thus far, a patent was issued for a "Four-Limb Exercising Attachment for Wheelchairs" and another patent has been allowed for a "Cervical Orthosis."



# CHAPTER 3

## "MEANINGFUL" ASSESSMENT OF DESIGN EXPERIENCES

*Brooke Hallowell*

During the past ten years, the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)<sup>13</sup> has worked to develop increasingly outcomes-focused standards for engineering education. This chapter is offered as an introduction to the ways in which improved foci on educational outcomes may lead to: (a) improvements in the learning of engineering students, especially those engaged in design projects to aid persons with disabilities, and consequently, (b) improved knowledge, design and technology to benefit individuals in need.

### **Brief History**

As part of a movement for greater accountability in higher education, U.S. colleges and universities are experiencing an intensified focus on the assessment of students' educational outcomes. The impetus for outcomes assessment has come most recently from accrediting agencies. All regional accrediting agencies receive their authority by approval from the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), which assumed this function from the Council on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA) in 1996. The inclusion of outcomes assessment standards as part of accreditation by any of these bodies, such as North Central, Middle States, or Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools, and professional accrediting bodies, including ABET, is mandated by CHEA, and thus is a requirement for all regional as well as professional accreditation. Consequently,

---

<sup>13</sup> Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (2000). Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET: Baltimore, MD.

candidates for accreditation are required to demonstrate plans for assessing educational outcomes, and evidence that assessment results have led to improved teaching and learning and, ultimately, better preparation for beginning professional careers. Accrediting bodies have thus revised criteria standards for accreditation with greater focus on the "output" that students can demonstrate and less on the "input" they are said to receive.<sup>14</sup>

### **"Meaningful" Assessment Practices**

Because much of the demand for outcomes assessment effort is perceived, at the level of instructors, as a bureaucratic chore thrust upon them by administrators and requiring detailed and time-consuming documentation, there is a tendency for many faculty members to avoid exploration of effective assessment practices. Likewise, many directors of academic departments engage in outcomes assessment primarily so that they may submit assessment documentation to meet bureaucratic requirements. Thus, there is a tendency in many academic units to engage in assessment practices that are not truly "meaningful".

Although what constitutes an "ideal" outcomes assessment program is largely dependent on the

---

<sup>14</sup> Hallowell, B. & Lund, N. (1998). Fostering program improvements through a focus on educational outcomes. In Council of Graduate Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, Proceedings of the nineteenth annual conference on graduate education, 32-56.

particular program and institution in which that program is to be implemented, there are at least some generalities we might make about what constitutes a "meaningful" program. For example:

An outcomes assessment program perceived by faculty and administrators as an imposition of bureaucratic control over what they do, remote from any practical implications... would not be considered "meaningful." Meaningful programs, rather, are designed to enhance our educational missions in specific, practical, measurable ways, with the goals of improving the effectiveness of training and education in our disciplines. They also involve all of a program's faculty and students, not just administrators or designated report writers. Furthermore, the results of meaningful assessment programs are actually used to foster real modifications in a training program.<sup>15</sup>

## Outcomes Associated with Engineering Design Projects

Despite the NSF's solid commitment to engineering design project experiences and widespread enthusiasm about this experiential approach to learning and service, there is a lack of documented solid empirical support for the efficacy and validity of design project experiences and the specific aspects of implementing those experiences. Concerted efforts to improve learning, assessment methods and data collection concerning pedagogic efficacy of engineering design project experiences will enhance student learning while benefiting the community of persons with disabilities.

## Agreeing on Terms

There is great variability in the terminology used to discuss educational outcomes. How we develop and use assessments matters much more than our agreement on the definitions of each of the terms we

---

<sup>15</sup> Hallowell, B. (1996). Innovative Models of Curriculum/Instruction: Measuring Educational Outcomes. In *Council of Graduate Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders, Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Conference on Graduate Education*, 37-44.

might use to talk about assessment issues. Still, for the sake of establishing common ground, a few key terms are highlighted here.

### *Formative and Summative Outcomes*

Formative outcomes indices are those that can be used to shape the experiences and learning opportunities of the very students who are being assessed. Some examples are surveys of faculty regarding current students' design involvement, on-site supervisors' evaluations, computer programming proficiency evaluations, and classroom assessment techniques.<sup>16</sup> The results of such assessments may be used to characterize program or instructor strengths and weaknesses, as well as to foster changes in the experiences of those very students who have been assessed.

Summative outcomes measures are those used to characterize programs, college divisions, or even whole institutions by using assessments intended to capture information about the final products of our programs. Examples are student exit surveys, surveys of graduates inquiring about salaries, employment, and job satisfaction, and surveys of employers of our graduates.

The reason the distinction between these two types of assessment is important is that, although formative assessments tend to be the ones that most interest our faculty and students and the ones that drive their daily academic experiences, the outcomes indices on which most administrators focus to monitor institutional quality are those involving summative outcomes. It is important that each academic unit strive for an appropriate mix of both formative and summative assessments.

### *Cognitive/Affective/Performative Outcome Distinctions*

To stimulate our clear articulation of the specific outcomes targeted within any program, it is helpful to have a way to characterize different types of outcomes. Although the exact terms vary from context to context, targeted educational outcomes are commonly characterized as belonging to one of three domains: cognitive, affective, and

---

<sup>16</sup> Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

performative. Cognitive outcomes are those relating to intellectual mastery, or mastery of knowledge in specific topic areas. Most of our course-specific objectives relating to a specific knowledge base fall into this category. Performance outcomes are those relating to a student's or graduate's accomplishment of a behavioral task. Affective outcomes relate to personal qualities and values that students ideally gain from their experiences during a particular educational/training program. Examples are appreciation of various racial, ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds of individuals, awareness of biasing factors in the design process, and sensitivity to ethical issues and potential conflicts of interest in professional engineering contexts.

The distinction among these three domains of targeted educational outcomes is helpful in highlighting areas of learning that we often proclaim to be important, but that we do not assess very well. Generally, we are better at assessing our targeted outcomes in the cognitive area (for example, with in-class tests and papers) than we are with assessing the affective areas of multicultural sensitivity, appreciation for collaborative teamwork, and ethics. Often, our assessment of performative outcomes is focused primarily on students' design experiences, even though our academic programs often have articulated learning goals in the performative domain that might not apply only to design projects.

### ***Faculty Motivation***

A critical step in developing a meaningful educational outcomes program is to address directly pervasive issues of faculty motivation. Faculty resistance is probably due in large part to the perception that outcomes assessment involves the use of educational and psychometric jargon to describe program indices that are not relevant to the everyday activities of faculty members and students. By including faculty, and perhaps student representatives, in discussions of what characterizes a meaningful assessment scheme to match the missions and needs of individual programs we can better ensure a sense of personal identification with assessment goals on the part of the faculty. Also, by agreeing to develop outcomes assessment practices from the bottom up, rather than in response to top-down demands from administrators and accrediting agencies, faculty member skeptics are more likely to engage in assessment efforts.

Additional factors that might give faculty the incentive to get involved in enriching assessment practices include:

- Consideration of outcomes assessment work as part of annual merit reviews,
- Provision of materials, such as sample instruments, or resources, such as internet sites to simplify the assessment instrument design process
- Demonstration of the means by which certain assessments, such as student exit or employer surveys, may be used to make strategic program changes.

These assessment practices may be used to a program's advantage in negotiations with administration (for example, to help justify funds for new equipment, facilities, or salaries for faculty and supervisory positions).<sup>14</sup>

With the recent enhanced focus on educational outcomes in accreditation standards of ABET, and with all regional accrediting agencies in the United States now requiring extensive outcomes assessment plans for all academic units, it is increasingly important that we share assessment ideas and methods among academic programs. It is also important that we ensure that our assessment efforts are truly meaningful, relevant and useful to our students and faculty.

### ***An Invitation to Collaborate in Using Assessment To Improve Design Projects***

Readers of this book are invited to join in collaborative efforts to improve student learning, and design products through improved meaningful assessment practices associated with NSF-sponsored design projects to aid persons with disabilities. Future annual publications on the NSF-sponsored engineering design projects to aid persons with disabilities will include input from students, faculty, supervisors, and consumers on ways to enhance associated educational outcomes in specific ways. The editors of this book look forward to input from the engineering education community for dissemination of further information to that end.

ABET's requirements for the engineering design experiences<sup>17</sup> provide direction in areas that are essential to assess in order to monitor the value of engineering design project experiences. For example, the following are considered "fundamental elements" of the design process: "the establishment of objectives and criteria, synthesis, analysis, construction, testing, and evaluation" (p. 11). Furthermore, according to ABET, specific targeted outcomes associated with engineering design projects should include:

- Development of student creativity,
- Use of open-ended problems,
- Development and use of modern design theory and methodology,
- Formulation of design problem statements and specifications,
- Consideration of alternative solutions, feasibility considerations,
- Production processes, concurrent engineering design, and
- Detailed system descriptions.

The accrediting board additionally stipulates that it is essential to include a variety of realistic constraints, such as economic factors, safety, reliability, aesthetics, ethics, and social impact. ABET's most recent, revised list of similar targeted educational outcomes is presented in the Appendix to this chapter. We encourage educators, students and consumers to consider the following questions:

- Are there outcomes, in addition to those specified by ABET, that we target in our roles as facilitators of design projects?
- Do the design projects of each of the students in NSF-sponsored programs incorporate all of these features?
- How may we best characterize evidence that students engaged in Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities effectively attain desired outcomes?
- Are there ways in which students' performances within any of these areas might be more validly assessed?
- How might improved formative assessment of students throughout the design

experience be used to improve their learning in each of these areas?

Readers interested in addressing such questions are encouraged to send comments to the editors of this book. The editors of this book are particularly interested in disseminating, through future publications, specific assessment instruments that readers find effective in evaluating targeted educational outcomes in NSF-sponsored engineering design projects.

Basic terminology related to pertinent assessment issues was presented earlier in this chapter. Brief descriptions of cognitive, performative, and affective types of outcomes are provided here, along with lists of example types of assessments that might be shared among those involved in engineering design projects.

Cognitive outcomes are those relating to intellectual mastery, or mastery of knowledge in specific topic areas. Some examples of these measures are:

- Comprehensive exams,
- Items embedded in course exams,
- Pre- and post-tests to assess "value added",
- Design portfolios,
- Rubrics for student self-evaluation of learning during a design experience,
- Alumni surveys, and
- Employer surveys.

Performative outcomes are those relating to a student's or graduate's accomplishment of a behavioral task. Some performance measures include:

- Evaluation of graduates' overall design experience,
- Mastery of design procedures or skills expected for all graduates,
- Student evaluation of final designs, or of design components,
- Surveys of faculty regarding student design competence,
- Evaluation of writing samples,
- Evaluation of presentations,
- Evaluation of collaborative learning and team-based approaches,
- Evaluation of problem-based learning,
- Employer surveys, and
- Peer evaluation (e.g., of leadership or group participation).

<sup>17</sup> Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology. Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET: Baltimore, MD.

Affective outcomes relate to personal qualities and values that students ideally gain from their educational experiences. These may include:

- Student journal reviews,
- Supervisors' evaluations of students' interactions with persons with disabilities,
- Evaluations of culturally-sensitive reports,
- Surveys of attitudes or satisfaction with design experiences,
- Interviews with students, and
- Peers', supervisors', and employers' evaluations.

We welcome contributions of relevant formative and summative assessment instruments, reports on assessment results, and descriptions of assessment programs and pedagogical innovations that appear

to be effective in enhancing design projects to aid persons with disabilities.

Please send queries or submissions for consideration to:

Brooke Hallowell, Ph.D.  
College of Health and Human Services  
W378 Grover Center  
Ohio University  
Athens, OH 45701

E-mail: [hallowel@ohio.edu](mailto:hallowel@ohio.edu)

## **APPENDIX: Desired Educational Outcomes as Articulated in ABET's New "Engineering Criteria 2000" (Criterion 3, Program Outcomes and Assessment)<sup>18</sup>**

Engineering programs must demonstrate that their graduates have:

- (a) An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering
- (b) An ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data
- (c) An ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs
- (d) An ability to function on multi-disciplinary teams
- (e) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems
- (f) An understanding of professional and ethical responsibility
- (g) An ability to communicate effectively
- (h) The broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context
- (i) A recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning
- (j) A knowledge of contemporary issues
- (k) An ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice

---

<sup>18</sup> Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (2000). Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET: Baltimore, MD (p. 38-39).



# CHAPTER 4

## USING NSF-SPONSORED PROJECTS TO ENRICH STUDENTS' WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS

*Brooke Hallowell*

Based on numerous anecdotes offered inside and outside of engineering, age-old stereotypes that engineers lack communication skills may have some basis in fact. However, current work environments for most new graduates in a host of professional biomedical engineering contexts place such heavy expectations for, and demands on, excellence in oral and written communication that engineers' lack of communication skills can no longer be tolerated as a trade-off for their strengths in science and mathematics. Evolving requirements for communication with interdisciplinary team members, clients, patients, consumers, employers, and the public require that educators of engineers work hard to ensure that students reach a standard of excellence in communication before they enter the workforce. This chapter is offered to provide specific guidance on principles and resources for enriching written communication skills in biomedical engineering students through their NSF-sponsored design project experiences.

### **A Formative Focus**

As discussed in the previous chapter, a formative focus on academic assessment allows educators to use assessment strategies that directly influence students who are still within their reach. A solid approach to formative assessment of writing skills involves repeated feedback to students throughout educational programs, with faculty collaboration in reinforcing expectations for written work, use of specific and effective writing evaluation criteria, and means of enhancing outcomes deemed important for regional and ABET accreditation<sup>19</sup>. Given that most

students in the NSF-sponsored Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities programs are already in their fourth year of college-level study, it is critical to recognize that previous formative writing instruction is essential to their continued development of writing skills during the senior year. Model strategies for improving writing presented here in light of senior design projects may also be implemented at earlier stages of undergraduate learning.

### **Clarifying Evaluation Criteria**

Student learning is directly shaped by how students think they will be assessed. Regardless of the lofty goals of excellence instructors might set forth in course syllabi and lectures, if specific performance criteria are not articulated clearly and assessed directly, then students are unlikely to reach for those same goals. To enhance writing skills effectively through the senior design experience, specific evaluation criteria for writing quality must be established at the start of the senior design experience. Clear expectations should be established for all written work, including related progress reports, web page content, and final reports. Although the examples provided here are oriented toward writing for annual NSF publications, the basic assessment process is ideally applied to other areas of written work as well.

---

<sup>19</sup> Engineering Criteria 2000 (Criterion 3, Program Outcomes and Assessment)

---

Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (2000). Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. ABET: Baltimore, MD (p. 38-39).

## Elements of Writing to be Assessed

What aspects of writing quality are important in writing about senior design projects? The list of specific ideal aspects probably varies widely among instructors. Still, consideration of guidelines already proposed may help to streamline the development of finely tuned assessment instruments to shape and evaluate student writing. Each year, the editors of this annual publication on senior design projects send guidelines for manuscript publication to principal investigators on NSF-sponsored Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities grants. Those guidelines form the basis for the elements of writing on which writing projects may be evaluated.

A sample grading form, based on the most recent version of those guidelines at the time of this publication, may be found in Appendix A. Explicit writing criteria are specified, and a means for explicit scoring according to those criteria is provided. Instructors may use such a form to evaluate drafts and final project reports. Specific item descriptions and the relative weighting of the value of performance in specific areas may be modified according to instructor preferences. Application of such scoring systems to student course grades will ensure greater student accountability for meeting explicit writing standards.

General categories for analyzing writing performance for project reports include: A) form and formatting, B) accompanying images, C) grammar, spelling, punctuation, and style, D) overall content, and E) content within specific sections.

Form and formatting concerns are related primarily to students' following of explicit instructions regarding page limitation, spacing, margins, font size, indentations, and headings. Items related to images include the type, quality, relevance and formatting of photographs and drawings used to illustrate reports. Issues of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and style may be largely addressed through adherence to specific conventions for each of these areas. Thorough proofreading and use of computerized checks for spelling and grammar, although frequently recommended by instructors, are not as likely to be carried out by students who are not expecting to be assessed for performance in these important areas.

Areas of overall content evaluation for senior design reports include aspects of writing that are often among the most problematic for undergraduate engineers. One such area is that of using appropriate language when referring to individuals with disabilities. Reports submitted for NSF publications often include terms and descriptions that may be considered offensive by many, such that the editors of this annual publication often engage in extensive rewriting of sections including client descriptions. It is most likely that students engaged in projects for persons with disabilities are wholeheartedly supportive of their clients, and use such terms out of naiveté rather than any ill intent. Still, the words we use to communicate about other people powerfully influences readers' perceptions of them, especially in cases in which readers may be unfamiliar with the types of conditions those people are experiencing. Using appropriate language is of paramount importance to our joint mission of enabling individuals to live fully and with maximum independence. It is thus critical that instructors provide clear instruction and modeling for appropriate language use in writing about disabilities. In cases where instructors may have outdated training concerning language use in this arena, it is critical that they seek training regarding sensitivity in language use.

Basic guidelines for writing with sensitivity about persons with disabilities are summarized briefly in Appendix B. Using person-first language, avoiding language that suggests that individuals with disabilities are "victims" or "sufferers", and avoiding words with negative connotations are three key components to appropriate language use.

Evaluation of content within specific sections of senior design project reports will help students focus on drafting and appropriately revising and editing reports. By discussing and evaluating specific criteria - such as the use of laypersons' terms in a project description, effective description of the motivation for a particular design approach, and the use of clear, concise technical language to describe a device modification such that others would be able to replicate the design - instructors may help students further hone their writing and revision skills.

## A Hierarchy of Revision Levels

Constructive feedback through multiple revisions of written work is critical to the development of

writing excellence. Even for the accomplished writer, a series of drafts with a progressive evolution toward a polished product is essential. It is thus important that instructors allow time for revision phases for all writing assignments throughout the senior design experience.

Three basic levels of writing revision proposed by some authors include global, organizational, and polishing revision<sup>20</sup>. Global revision involves a general overhaul of a document. Macro-level feedback to students about their general flow of ideas and adherence to assignment guidelines helps to shape an initially-submitted draft into a version more suitable for organizational revision. Organizational revision requires reshaping and reworking of the text. Helpful feedback to students at this level may involve revising of macro-level issues not corrected since the initial draft, and/or a focus on new micro-level issues of coherence, clarity, relevance, and word choice. Polishing revision entails attention to such flaws as grammatical errors, misspellings, misuse of punctuation, and to specific formatting rules for the assignment. Finding patterns of errors and providing constructive feedback about those patterns may help individuals or teams of students learn efficient strategies for improving their written work.

### **Structured Critical Peer Evaluation**

Many instructors require several forms of written assignments within project design courses, including the final reports required for submission to the NSF-sponsored annual publication. Consequently, it is impractical or impossible for many instructors to provide evaluation and feedback at three levels of revision for each written assignment. One means of promoting students' experience with critical reflection on writing is to implement assignments of structured critical evaluation of writing using reader-response strategies, with students as editors for other students' work. Students (as individuals or on teams) may be given a basic or detailed rubric for evaluating other students' written work, and explicit

guidelines for providing structured constructive comments following critical evaluation.

### **Resources and Support**

Numerous excellent texts are available to promote and provide structure and guidance for the development of essential writing skills in engineering students. Some sample recommended texts are listed in Appendix C. Comments and suggestions from instructors who have developed model writing programs for engineering design courses at any level of study are welcome to submit those to the editors of this book, to be considered for future publication.

It is the profound hope of the editors of this book that future improvements in reports submitted for NSF-sponsored publications will reflect instructors' increasingly greater attention to the quality of student-generated writing. With continuously enhanced attention to the development of engineering students' writing through improved foci on writing skills and strategic assessment of written work, all with interest in design projects for persons with disabilities will benefit.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ohio University Center for Writing Excellence Teaching Handouts [on-line] (2002). Available at: [http://www.ohiou.edu/writing/3\\_Ls\\_of\\_Revisio n.htm](http://www.ohiou.edu/writing/3_Ls_of_Revisio n.htm)

## APPENDIX A: Sample Evaluation Form for Project Reports Prepared for Annual NSF Publications on Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities

Item evaluated	Score/ Possible Score
<b>A. Form and formatting</b>	
Does not exceed two pages (unless authorized by instructor)	/2
10 point size type throughout the manuscript	/2
Margin settings: top =1", bottom=1", right=1", and left=1"	/2
Title limited to 50 characters on each line (if longer than 50 characters, then skips two lines and continues, with a blank line between title text lines)	/1
Text single spaced	/2
No indenting of paragraphs	/1
Blank line inserted between paragraphs	/1
Identifying information includes: project title, student name, name of client coordinator(s), supervising professor(s), university address	/2
Appropriate headings provided for Introduction, Summary of impact, and Technical description sections	/2
<b>Total points for form and formatting</b>	<b>/15</b>
<b>B. Images</b>	
Photographs in black and white, not color	/1
Photographs are hard copies of photo prints, not digital	/1
Line art done with a laser printer or drawn professionally by pen with India (black) ink	/2
Images clearly complement the written report content	/2
Photographs or line art attached to report by paperclip	/1
Photographs or line art numbered on back to accompany report	/1
Figure headings inserted within the text with title capitalization, excluding words such as "drawing of" or "photograph of"	/2
<b>Total points for images</b>	<b>/10</b>

<b>C. Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and style</b>	
Consistent tenses throughout each section of the report	/2
Grammatical accuracy, including appropriate subject-verb agreement	/2
Spelling accuracy	/2
Appropriate punctuation	/2
Abbreviations and symbols used consistently throughout (For example, " or in. throughout for "inch;" excludes apostrophe for plural on abbreviations, such as "BMEs" or "PCs"	/2
Uses the word "or" rather than a slash (/) (For example, "He or she can do it without assistance.")	/1
Numbers one through 9 spelled out in text; number representations for 10 and higher presented in digit form (except in series of numbers below and above 10, or in measurement lists)	/1
In lists, items numbered, with commas between them (for example: "The device was designed to be: 1) safe, 2) lightweight, and 3) reasonably priced.")	/1
Consistent punctuation of enumerated and bulleted lists throughout the report	/2
<b>Total points for grammar, spelling, punctuation, and style</b>	<b>/15</b>

<b>D. Overall content</b>	
Excludes extensive tutorials on specific disabilities	/2
Demonstrates appropriate language regarding individuals with disabilities	/3
Avoids redundancy of content among sections	/3
Demonstrates clear and logical flow of ideas	/3
Excludes use of proper names of clients	/3
Citation and reference provided for any direct quote from published material	/1
<b>Total points for overall content</b>	<b>/15</b>

<b>E. Section content</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	
Includes a brief description of the project in laypersons' terms	/4
Includes problem addressed, approach taken, motivation for the approach, a summary of usual or existing solutions, and problems with these solutions	/4
<b>Summary of impact</b>	
Includes a brief description of how this project has improved the quality of life of a person with a disability	/5
Includes a quoted statement from an educational or health care specialist who supervises the client, or from a significant other	/2
Includes a description of the project's usefulness and overall design evaluation	/5
<b>Technical description</b>	
Clear, concise technical description of the device or device modification such that others would be able to replicate the design	/10
Detailed parts lists included only if parts are of such a special nature that the project could not be fabricated without the exact identity of the part	/2
Text refers to circuit and/or mechanical drawing of the device	/3
Includes analysis of design effectiveness	/5
Concludes with approximate cost of the project, including parts and supplies (not just the NSF's contribution) and excluding personnel costs	/5
<b>Total points for section content</b>	<b>/45</b>

## Evaluation Summary

<b>A. Total points for form and formatting</b>	<b>/15</b>
<b>B. Total points for images</b>	<b>/10</b>
<b>C. Total points for grammar, spelling, punctuation, style</b>	<b>/15</b>
<b>D. Total points for overall content</b>	<b>/15</b>
<b>E. Total points for section content</b>	<b>/45</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>/100</b>

## APPENDIX B: A Summary of Guidelines for Writing about Persons with Disabilities

The World Health Organization (WHO) has launched world-wide efforts to modify the ways in which we refer to persons with disabilities. The WHO emphasizes that disablement is not considered an attribute of an individual, but rather the complex interactions of conditions involving a person in the context of his or her social environment. One classification scheme proposed by the WHO, the International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH) employs the general terms "impairment", "disability", and "handicap", while a more recent scheme, the ICIDH-2, employs the terms "impairment", "activity", and "participation", to refer to the various contextual aspects of disabling conditions one might experience.<sup>21</sup> Healthcare professionals and researchers throughout the world are following suit by de-emphasizing the reference to individuals according to medically-based diagnostic categories, focusing instead on their holistic functional concerns and what might be done to address them. Readers of this book are encouraged to join in this important movement. General guidelines are presented here.

### *Recognize the importance of currency and context in referring to individuals with disabilities*

There are always variances in the terms that particular consumers or readers prefer, and it is essential to keep current regarding changes in accepted terminology.

### *Refer to "disabilities"*

Although the very term "disability" may be considered offensive to some (with its inherent focus on a lack of ability), it is currently preferred over the term "handicap" in reference to persons with physical, cognitive, and/or psychological challenges or "disabilities".

### *Use person-first language.*

Person-first language helps emphasize the importance of the individuals mentioned rather than their disabilities. For example, it is appropriate to refer to a "person with a disability" instead of "disabled person," and to say "a child with cerebral palsy" instead of "a cerebral palsied child."

### *Avoid using condition labels as nouns*

Many words conveying information about specific disabilities exist in both noun and adjectival forms, yet should primarily be used only as adjectives, or even better, modified into nouns corresponding to conditions, as in the person-first language examples given above. For example, it is not appropriate to call an individual with aphasia "an aphasic." Although the term "an aphasic individual" would be preferred to the use of "an aphasic" as a noun, such labeling may convey a lack of respect for, and sensitivity toward, individuals who have aphasia.<sup>22</sup> A more appropriate term would be "person with aphasia." Likewise, it is not appropriate to call an individual with paraplegia "a paraplegic," or to call persons with disabilities "the disabled."

### *Avoid Language of Victimization*

Do not use language suggesting that clients are "victims" or people who "suffer" from various forms of disability. For example, say, "the client had a stroke" rather than "the client is a stroke victim." Say, "She uses a wheelchair," rather than "she is confined to a wheelchair." Say "her leg was

---

<sup>21</sup> World Health Organization (1999). ICIDH-2: International Classification of Impairments, Activities and Participation: A manual of dimensions of disablement and health [on-line]. Available: <http://www.who.int/msa/mnh/ems/icidh/introduction.htm>

---

<sup>22</sup> Brookshire, R.H. (1992). *An introduction to neurogenic communications disorders*. St. Louis: Mosby - Year Book.

amputated...” instead of, “the client suffered an amputation of the leg.”

***Avoid Words with Negative Connotations***

Words that evoke derogatory connotations should be avoided. These include such words and phrases as affliction, crazy, crippled, defective, deformed, dumb, insane, invalid, lame, maimed, mute, retard, and withered.

***Encourage Others in Appropriate Language Use***

By modeling appropriate language in writing about persons with disabilities, authors take an important

step in helping others to improve in this area. It is also important to help others learn to implement guidelines such as these directly through course work and other educational experiences. Likewise, polite and constructive corrections of others using inaccurate language helps encourage more positive communication as well as more enabling positive societal attitudes, widening the arena for empowering persons with disabilities.



# CHAPTER 5

## CONNECTING STUDENTS WITH PERSONS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES

Kathleen Laurin, Ph.D., CRC (Certified Rehabilitation Counselor),  
Department of Special Education Counseling, Reading and Early Childhood (SECREC),  
Montana State University,  
1500 University Dr., Billings, MT 59101-0298, (406) 657-2064,  
klaurin@msubillings.edu

Steven Barrett<sup>23</sup>, Ph.D., P.E.,  
Assistant Professor Electrical and Computer Engineering  
College of Engineering,  
P.O. Box 3295, Laramie, WY 82071-3295  
steveb@uwyo.edu

Kyle Colling, Ph.D.,  
Department of Special Education Counseling, Reading and Early Childhood (SECREC),  
Montana State University,  
1500 University Dr., Billings, MT 59101-0298, (406) 657-2056,  
kcolling@msubillings.edu

Kay Cowie, Assistant Lecturer, MS,  
Department of Special Education,  
The University of Wyoming,  
Mcwhinnie Hall 220, Laramie, WY 82071, (307) 766-2902,  
kaycowie@uwyo.edu

---

<sup>23</sup> Portions of “The Engineering Perspective” were presented at the 40th Annual Rocky Mountain Bioengineering Symposium, April 2003, Biloxi, MS (Barrett, 2003)

## INTRODUCTION

For many students, participation in the National Science Foundation (NSF) projects to aid persons with disabilities is a unique experience. Often it is their first opportunity to work with individuals with disabilities. As such, not only must they meet the academic requirements of their senior design project, but in order to be successful, they must also learn about disabilities and related issues. Only when students are able to combine their scientific knowledge with an understanding of other related humanistic factors will they be able to make significant contributions to the field. Therefore, it is imperative for engineering programs participating in the NSF projects to ensure that students have the opportunity to gain the necessary awareness and social competencies needed. Specifically, students need to have a basic understanding of philosophical attitudes toward disability as well as an understanding of assistive technology and how to communicate effectively with persons with disabilities. This awareness and understanding will not only enable students to have a more meaningful experience, but also ensure a more meaningful experience for the individuals with whom they will be working.

Students must also understand the engineering aspects of their project. The engineering aspects may be viewed from two different levels: the programmatic aspects of the project and the engineering details of their specific project. At the program level, projects must be properly scoped for difficulty and required expertise. At the individual project level the projects must meet specific requirements but also must be safe and reliable. Senior design faculty as well as participating students have the joint responsibility of ensuring these engineering aspects are met.

In this chapter we will discuss these diverse yet related aspects of National Science Foundation engineering senior design projects to aid persons with disabilities. We will first examine the social constructs of disability, followed by the proper language of disability. We will then investigate assistive technology and universal design principles. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the engineering aspects for a successful design experience.

## *Models of Disability*

There are three predominant social constructs of disability. These models define the source or problem of disability, who holds the onus, and the ways that best address the related issues. The oldest model is the moral model, which posits that disability is caused by moral lapse or sin. It explains disability as a supernatural phenomena or act of God that serves as punishment and represents the consequences of perceived wrongdoing. It brings shame to the individual and in cultures that emphasize family and/or groups over the individual, the shame spreads to the family and/or group. The person and/or family carry the blame for causing the disability. In a tenuously more auspicious interpretation of the moral model, disability is perceived as a test of faith, i.e. "God only gives us what we can bear" or as a mystical experience in which one sense may be impaired but others are heightened and the adversity of the disability provides increased emotional and spiritual strength often recognized by the belief that "with the grace of God" the disability can be overcome.

Given the limitations of the moral model, the medical model began to emerge in the mid- 1800s as a result of developing science and improved humanistic medicine. In this model, disability is recognized as a medical problem that resides within the individual. It is a dysfunction, defect, or abnormality that needs to be fixed. The ambition is to restore normality and cure the individual. It is a paternalistic model that expects an individual to assume the role of a victim or sick person and avail themselves to medical professionals and services. The individual is a passive participant. However, as medicine and professionals have advanced in their knowledge and understanding, this model has given way to a more person centered version, often referred to as the rehabilitation model, in which disability is analyzed in terms of function and limitations. In this paradigm, a more holistic approach is taken. The individual is a more active participant and his or her goals are the basis for therapeutic intervention. The emphasis is on functioning within one's environments and a variety of factors are assessed in terms of barriers and or facilitators to increased functioning. This model recognizes disability as the corollary of interaction between the individual and the environment. The individual is recognized as a client and the emphasis is based on assisting the individual in adjusting or adapting. It is important to note that, although this

model derives from a systems approach, the primary issues of disability are still attributed to the individual.

In the last 30 years, another model has emerged, the social model of disability, which is also referred to as a minority group model and/or independent living model. Its genesis resides within the disability rights movement and proclaims that disability is a social construction. Specifically, the problem of disability is not within the individual, but within the environment and systems with which the individual must interact. The barriers that prevent individuals with disabilities from participating fully and equally within society include prejudice, discrimination, inaccessible environments, inadequate support, and economic dependence.

While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to view these constructs in detail, an awareness of these models enables one to examine their own beliefs and attitudes toward disability. It also helps students understand that they will encounter both professionals and persons with disabilities whose beliefs are rooted in any one (or combination of) these identified constructs. Although it may not be readily evident, these beliefs will impact how students approach their projects, their ability to see beyond the disability and consider other related factors, and their ability to establish meaningful relationships with the individuals they are trying to assist. Therefore, it is highly recommended that all engineering programs establish collaborative partnerships with other disability professionals in order to provide students with an awareness of disability issues. Potential partners include other programs within the university, especially those with disability studies programs, state assistive technology projects, and independent living centers.

### *Language of Disability*

Terminology and phrases used to describe many people (those with and without disabilities) have changed over time. Many words and phrases are embedded in the social constructs and ideologies of our history and the changes in terminology reflect the paradigm shifts that have occurred over time. For example, the terms Native American or African American have changed with the *Zeitgeist* and no longer reflect the often derogatory words or phrases that preceded them. Although there is often disdain for those that advocate political correctness, it is important to realize that words and expressions can

be very powerful and they do in fact communicate attitudes, perceptions, feelings, and stereotypes. They can be oppressive or empowering. The changes in language that have occurred represent an acceptance of diversity and a respect for differences which ultimately impact social change. As professionals and educators, we are in fact, agents of change, and it is our responsibility to recognize the power of language and to use it befittingly in our conversations, discussions and writings.

In regard to disability, the use of person first language (i.e. always putting the person before the disability) recognizes the person first and foremost as a unique individual. In contrast, referring to someone by his or her disability defines them by a single attribute and limits the ability to distinguish who they are as a person from the disability, which in fact they may consider to be a very minute characteristic. For example, the statement “The stroke victim’s name is Joe” conjures up a very different image from “Joe is a great musician who had a stroke last year”, or “she can’t ski; she is paralyzed and confined to a wheelchair” versus “she loves to ski and uses a sit ski device because she has paraplegia and is a wheelchair user.” Putting the person before the disability demonstrates respect and acknowledges the person for who they are, not for what they do or do not have. Although it may seem awkward when one first begins to use person first language, it will become natural over time, it will demonstrate respect, and it will have a positive societal impact. For general guidelines on person first language, a keyword internet search will reveal many resources. For guidelines on writing, see Chapter 4.

### *Assistive Technology and Universal Design*

Assistive Technology (AT) is a general term that describes any piece of equipment or device that may be used by a person with a disability to perform specific tasks and to improve or maintain functional capabilities, thus providing a greater degree of independence, inclusion, and/or community integration. It can help redefine what is possible for people with a wide range of cognitive, physical, or sensory disabilities. AT can be simple or complex, and can include off the shelf items as well as special design. Devices become AT through their application. This technology may range from very low-cost, low-tech adaptations (such as a battery interrupter to make a toy switch accessible) to high-

tech, very expensive devices (such as a powered mobility equipment and environmental controllers).

Assistive Technology can include cognitive aids, aids to assist with walking, dressing, and other activities of daily living, aids to augment hearing or vision, adaptive recreation devices, augmentative communication aids, and alternate computer access. Services related to Assistive Technology may include evaluation for appropriate equipment and systems, assistance with purchasing or leasing devices, and selecting, defining, fitting, adapting, applying, maintaining, repairing, or replacement of equipment and systems. In addition, services could include training and technical assistance for individuals and their families, and/or other professionals. Assistive Technology may be used at home, in the workplace, in the classroom and in the community to provide creative solutions in assisting individuals as they go about their activities of living, learning, working, and playing.

Universal Design (UD) refers to a concept or philosophy for designing and delivering products and services that are usable by people with the widest possible range of functional capabilities. This includes products and services that are directly usable (without requiring assistive technology) and products and services that are made usable with assistive technology.

As noted earlier, the social model of disability focuses on the environment as the most significant barrier preventing people with disabilities from full contribution to all aspects of society. As such, the concepts of universal design have significant potential for remedy (see reference section for resources specific to universal design). The basic premise of universal design is to create access, in terms of the mass marketplace as well as community and information environments, for as many people as possible, regardless of age, size, or ability.

It is estimated that approximately thirty million people have a disability or functional limitation due to injury, illness or aging (Vanderheidin, 1990). With the advances in modern medicine and the emerging inroads in health promotion and disease prevention, people are living longer. Nearly everyone will experience some type of functional limitation during the course of a lifetime. Given such broad prevalence of disability in the general population, the need for universal design becomes self-evident.

The underlying principles of universal design (UD) are available for review at [www.design.ncsu.edu](http://www.design.ncsu.edu). The Center for Universal design, North Carolina State University. These basic principles provide the philosophical interface between functional limitations/disability and best practices in design. In fact, universal design principles can often simplify the adaptation or even eliminate the need for specialized design created specifically for the individual person. Conversely, when prototype devices are necessary, if they adhere to principles of UD, it is much more likely that the device will also be able to be adopted by others and that the technology will be able to be transferred to other applications. When assistive technology is necessary to support access and/or use of the built environment, products, or information, the understanding that any design must first and foremost respect personal dignity and enhance independence without stigmatizing the individual is critical. This is clearly a quality of life issue for everyone. Working with an individual who has disabilities to develop assistive technology requires the engineer to actively collaborate, respecting the right of each person to self-determination and self-control (Shapiro, 1993).

In general, the areas of functional limitation most amenable to benefit from the concepts of universal design (and assistive technology where necessary) are in the broad categories of: communication, mobility, sensory, manipulation, and cognition including memory. All design should consider and address varying human abilities across each of these domains. The goal of universal design is to eliminate, as much as possible, the need for assistive technologies because the focus of all design is inclusive rather than restrictive. Historically, designs were often based on the young, able-bodied male. With the advent of UD, designers are redefining the user to include as many people as possible with the widest range of abilities.

There are many examples of how assistive technologies have been adopted by the general population. For example, at one time the use of closed captioning was limited to individuals who were hard of hearing or deaf. Today, captioning can be seen on televisions located in public places such as restaurants, airports, and sports bars. Captioning is also used by many people in their own homes when one person wishes to watch TV while another does not. Other examples include ramps, curb cuts

and automatic door openers. Initially designed for individuals who were wheelchair users, it was quickly realized they also benefited delivery personnel, people with strollers, people with temporary injuries, cyclists, etc. In addition, many items related to computer access such as voice recognition, are now employed in a variety of computer and telecommunication applications. When UD principles are employed, the whole environment, in the broadest sense becomes more humane and maximizes the potential contribution of everyone, not just those with disabilities.

As senior design students explore their options for projects, an awareness of disability issues, existing assistive technologies and universal design principles will ensure that their projects incorporate state-of-the-art practices. A list of valuable resources is included at the end of this chapter.

### *The Engineering Perspective*

To provide for a successful Engineering Senior Design Projects to Aid Persons with Disabilities Program, projects must be successful at both the program level and the individual project level. In this section we discuss aspects of a successful program and use the University of Wyoming's program as a case study.

To be successful at the academic program level, a program must successfully address the following aspects:

- Provide a team approach between assistive technology professionals and engineering participants,
- Receive appropriate publicity within assistive technology channels,
- Provide projects that have been properly scoped for difficulty, student team size, and required student expertise, and
- Have mechanisms in place to address the safety aspects of each project and the legal aspects of the program.

To address these needs, the College of Engineering partnered with four other programs to identify the specific needs of the individual. Specifically, the college joined with the Wyoming Institute for Disabilities (WIND) assistive technology program, Wyoming New Options in Technology (WYNOT) (including their Sports and Outdoor Assistive

Recreation (SOAR) project) and the university's Special Education program.

With this assembled team of professionals, we assigned specific duties to the team members. The WYNOT Project Director served as the coordinator with the community to identify specific assistive technology needs. This was accomplished using a short project application to identify the desired assistive device and the special needs of the individual. Project proposals were initiated by the individual with a disability, his/her family members, caregivers, teachers, or any of the service agencies in the state of Wyoming. WYNOT was also the key player in the promotion of the Biomedical Engineering Program and Research to Aid Persons with Disabilities (BME/RAPD). Marketing included featured articles in the WYNOT newsletter, posting of project information on the WYNOT website, development of a project website, (<http://www.eng.uwyo.edu/electrical/faculty/barr ett/assist/>), public service announcements, and statewide and nationwide press releases.

The WYNOT project director and the engineering PI met on a regular basis to evaluate the suitability of the submitted projects. Specifically, each requested project was reviewed to ensure it was sufficiently challenging for a year long senior design project. Also, the required engineering expertise was scoped for each project. Once a project was determined to be of suitable scope for an undergraduate design project, the PI coordinated with the appropriate engineering department(s) to publicize the project in the senior design course. This process is illustrated in Figure 5.1. Overall, an individual with a disability was linked with a student engineering team to provide a prototype custom designed assistive device specific to his/her needs.

Since these projects involve the use of human subjects, students were required to complete an Institutional Review Board (IRB) study prior to initiating a specific project. These studies were completed and submitted to the IRB per federal and university guidelines. Furthermore, projects were delivered to the recipients only after extensive testing. At that time the recipient or their legal guardian signed a "Hold Harmless" agreement. This agreement was reviewed and approved by the university's legal office.

At the individual project level, students must:




Figure 5.1. Program Flow for Undergraduate Design Projects to Aid Wyoming Persons with Disabilities [Barrett, 2003].

- Be educated on assistive technology awareness,
- Be committed to delivering a completed, quality project,
- Be aware of available expertise to assist with the technical aspects of the project,
- Work closely with the individual who will be using the project, and
- Provide adequate time in the project schedule for testing and remanufacture if required.

To assist the students in developing these aspects of the project, the PI met with each senior design course at the beginning of the semester. The PI reviewed the purpose of the program, described potential projects, and also emphasized the importance of delivering a completed project. Students were encouraged to meet individually with the PI if they wanted more information about a specific project. At these follow-up meetings, the students were given all available information about the project and a point of contact to obtain more information from the requesting assistive technology agency or individual. Students were encouraged to contact these individuals to begin developing a relationship between the project user and designer.

Many of the projects were interdisciplinary in nature typically involving both mechanical and electrical engineering students. Faculty advisors for the senior design courses set up several “get acquainted” sessions at the local pizza parlor for students to get to know each other and also to review potential projects.

WYNOT also provided training to the engineering students regarding assistive devices and services. This training was provided to all students in the senior design course regardless if they were participating in the assistive technology program. This provided disability awareness to the state’s next generation of engineers.

### *Expected Benefits*

It is a challenge to get a program of this type initiated; however, the potential benefits far outweigh these challenges. Here is a list of potential benefits:

- Provide engineering students multi-disciplinary, meaningful, community service design projects,
- Provide persons with disabilities assistive devices to empower them to achieve the maximum individual growth and development and afford them the opportunity to participate in all aspects of life as they choose,
- Provide engineering students education and awareness on the special needs and challenges of persons with disabilities, and
- Provide undergraduate engineering students exposure to the biomedical field of engineering.

This quote from a student who participated in the program best sums up the expected benefit,

“As an undergraduate student in the college of engineering, this project personally affected my life in many ways. It not only challenged me to think creatively and to be able to come up with an original

design, but it also allowed me to see at a young age how the work I do can better other lives. I am proud to have been a part of this project and to know that something that I helped design and build is allowing people from around the state of Wyoming to be educated about disabilities (Barnes, 2003)."

## Resources

### *Resources on Disability:*

The Family Village is a website maintained by the Waisman Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison,

<http://www.familyvillage.wisc.edu/index.html>

The Library section allows individuals to search for specific diagnoses or general information on numerous disabilities.

The ILRU (Independent Living Research Utilization) <http://www.ilru.org/ilru.html> program is a national center for information, training, research, and technical assistance in independent living. The directory link provides contact information for all Independent Living Centers in the country and US territories.

### *Resources on Assistive Technology:*

The National Institute on Disability Rehabilitation and Research,

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/NIDRR/>

funds the state Assistive Technology projects as well as Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers (RERC). The state projects are excellent resources on a variety of AT issues and the RERC's conduct programs of advanced research of an engineering or technical nature in order to develop and test new engineering solutions to problems of disability. Information on these centers is available through the NIDRR website by searching their project directory for Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers. These centers specialize in a variety of areas including mobility, communication, hearing, vision, spinal cord injury, recreation, prosthetics and orthotics, and wireless technologies to name just a few. These are excellent resources to learn more on state-of-the-art engineering projects to assist individuals with disabilities.

Another valuable source is the Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology Society of North America (RESNA) <http://www.resna.org/>. This is a transdisciplinary organization that

promotes research, development, education, advocacy and the provision of technology for individuals with disabilities. In addition, by using the technical assistance project link on the home page, one can then locate all of the state assistive technology projects and obtain contact information for their particular state or territory.

For specific product information, <http://www.assistivetech.net/> as well as [http://www.abledata.com/Site\\_2/welcome.htm](http://www.abledata.com/Site_2/welcome.htm) are excellent resources.

### *Resources on Universal Design:*

The Center for Universal Design, North Carolina State University, <http://www.design.ncsu.edu/cud>.

The Trace Research and Development Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison, <http://www.trace.wisc.edu>.

The Center for Inclusive Design and Environmental Access (IDEA), University at Buffalo, New York, [www.ap.buffalo.edu/idea](http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/idea).

## References

J. Barnes, S. Popp, S.F. Barrett, K. Laurin, J. Childester Bloom (2003). Starwriter - Experiences in NSF Undergraduate Design Projects. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Rocky Mountain Bioengineering Symposium 2003, Instrument Society of America, 437, 591-596*.

S.F. Barrett, K. Laurin, J. Childester Bloom (2003). Undergraduate Design Projects to Aid Wyoming Persons with Disabilities. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Rocky Mountain Bioengineering Symposium 2003, Instrument Society of America, Volume 437, 597-602*.

Shapiro, J. (1993). No pity: People with disabilities, a new civil rights movement. New York: Random House.

Vanderheiden, G. (1990). "Thirty-something (million): Should they be exceptions?" *Human Factors, 32, (4), 383-396*.

