

International Product Design & Development Graduate Courses: The MIT-Portugal Collaboration

Yehudit Judy Dori

*Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa
32000, Israel
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, MA 02139*

Arlindo Silva

*Mechanical Engineering Department,
Instituto Superior Tecnico, Technical
University of Lisbon, Portugal*

Abstract

The Product Design and Development (PDD) course is part of the graduate curriculum in the Engineering Design and Advanced Manufacturing (EDAM) study in the MIT-Portugal program. The research participants included about 100 students from MIT, EDAM, and two universities in Portugal, Instituto Superior Técnico (IST) with Universidade do Porto (FEUP). We investigated the PDD EDAM course in the context of Project-Based Learning (PBL) approach as well as two other groups who studied a similar course in a different setting. Research tools included questionnaires, with questions related to students' learning outcomes and perceptions as well as focus groups with EDAM faculty and students. In a question related to the product life cycle stages the MIT and EDAM students listed on average a higher number of items than that of the IST & FEUP students, indicating a higher level of learning. The learning approach that follows the MIT PDD course has been instrumental in successfully incorporating hands-on activities and students-faculty interactions into the EDAM program and in creating collaborations between faculty from MIT and Portuguese universities. While the PBL approach reported here was done mostly in a face-to-face setting, it is not restricted to this mode. It can be used also via distance and e-Learning technologies to help graduate students from various countries increase their access to quality university education for a larger percentage of the population. However, the lack of experience of the integration of e-learning, either synchronous or asynchronous, into teaching in a PBL mode, calls for further research in this domain.

1. Introduction

Engineering is under constant change due to increasing globalization, impacting the way engineers work and companies make use of their employees' innovation. As Vest [1] noted:

“The engineering workforce of tomorrow, and indeed that of today, will face profound new challenges. Every day the men and women of this workforce will face the stress of competing in the fast-paced world of change we call the knowledge-based global economy of the twenty-first century. They will also face even larger challenges because the nation and world will need to call on them to seize opportunities and solve global problems of unprecedented scope and scale.” (p. 235)

This is the context in which the MIT-Portugal Program (MPP) has been formed as an initiative by the Portuguese Government. MPP, which includes six Portuguese Universities and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was created after recognizing that Portugal was lagging behind in the world economy for the past decade or more. MPP, together with programs with other foreign universities, was initiated with the objective of enhancing Portuguese higher education and bringing it closer to industrial needs [2]. MPP is divided in four different focus areas: Biotechnology, Sustainable Energy Systems, Transportation Systems, and Engineering Design and Advanced Manufacturing (EDAM). Within the EDAM focus area, three Portuguese engineering schools are involved: Escola de Engenharia da Universidade do Minho (UM) in Guimarães, Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto (FEUP) in Porto, and Instituto Superior Técnico (IST) – Universidade Técnica de Lisboa in Lisbon.

The main objective of the Engineering Design and Advanced Manufacturing (EDAM) focus area is to provide Portuguese industry with people with higher education levels and global perspectives on engineering design and product development – the core capabilities in technological innovation. EDAM

itself is divided in two separate third cycle study programs: the doctoral program in Leaders for Technical Industries (LTI) and an Executive Masters program in Technology Management Enterprise (TME). The set of courses devised to fulfill the objectives for these programs is explained elsewhere [2].

One of the key courses offered to both LTI and TME students is the Product Design and Development (PDD) course. This course was developed based on project-based learning, as a means to introduce students to the challenges commonly confronted within the engineering profession. The engineering profession involves handling uncertainty, incomplete data, constant change in the working environment, and conflicting requirements from various stakeholders. Despite the superiority of project-based learning for addressing these challenges, lecture-based delivery is still common practice in many universities and colleges [3].

Project-based or problem-based learning (PBL) has been defined in the educational literature rather broadly. PBL has been used interchangeably for problem- and project-based learning. Thomas [4] who reviewed research on PBL found five criteria for classifying this approach:

1. Centrality: PBL-type projects are central to the curriculum.
2. Driving question: The projects focus on questions or problems that “drive” students to confront central concepts and principles of a discipline.
3. Constructive investigations: The central activities of the project involve students' knowledge construction.
4. Autonomy: Projects are student-driven to a significant extent.
5. Realism: Projects are realistic or authentic.

With a strong encouragement of the ABET engineering accreditation criteria upper level engineering courses have evolved over the years from projects “invented” by faculty to industry-related projects where companies provide authentic problems, along with expertise and sometimes financial support [5, 6]. Examples of studies that investigate the effect of PBL in higher education included cooperative undergraduate student projects [7], science projects carried out by prospective teachers who acted as practitioners and as instructors [8], and a research conducted at the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, which integrated project-based learning into three academic chemistry courses [9]. In the latter study, undergraduate science and engineering students who carried out PBL activities performed significantly better than their control peers not only on their posttest, but also on their course final examination. The results indicated that PBL incorporated into academic courses can enhance students' understanding of chemical concepts, theories, and molecular structures.

Developments in student-centered approaches, such as project-based learning, are just starting to make a dent in the practice of engineering education [10, 11]. There is a gap between Portuguese universities and industry with respect to product development and entrepreneurship. Teaching these topics is expected to promote students' thinking skills and ability to successfully launch new businesses [12]. Particularly at senior levels of engineering degree programs, others are also experimenting with project-based learning. The differences between freshmen and seniors in design problem solving are another important topic of research. Researchers performed a comprehensive study to analyze the behavior of freshmen and senior students when faced with a typical open-ended design problem. Results have shown that seniors produced higher quality solutions, spent more time solving the problem, considered more alternative solutions and made more transitions between design steps than freshmen [13, 14]. Given the results from this study, one can infer that the difference between freshmen and seniors is the capacity of the latter to concentrate not only on solving the problem but also on setting the problem itself [15]. This is an extremely important fact, often seen in freshmen's work method: concentrating on problem solving, relying on rational and cognitive tools and deductive procedures. Design problems are oftentimes ill-defined and always encompass non-technical issues, which render deductive and rational approaches inadequate before the actual problem is well set and a reasonable design boundary is drawn.

There are a number of Universities that have excelled over the years in teaching product development to their undergraduate and graduate students, one of which is undoubtedly MIT. Product development encompasses activities that are part of the product lifecycle, starting with a market need and ending in the production and sale of the product. According to Ulrich and Eppinger [16] the product development process is the sequence of activities carried out by an enterprise to design, build, and commercialize a product. The PBL approach to teaching lends itself to the broader perspective that is needed for today's engineers, who must be capable of crossing boundaries to understand technical and non-technical issues in design problems and collaborate with peers from variety of disciplines.

2. Research Goal, Questions, and Setting

The goal of this research was to assess the Product Design and Development (PDD) course primarily within the EDAM focus area of the MIT-Portugal Program. The research included graduate students who were divided into three groups: (1) Engineering Systems Division at MIT, (2) EDAM program, which included students from three universities in Portugal, and (3) Instituto Superior Técnico – Universidade Técnica de Lisboa (IST) and Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto (FEUP). The EDAM course is a PhD level course – or, in the European jargon, at a third cycle level – whereas the others are all at a Masters level. The research questions called for (1) assessing the PDD EDAM course and (2) finding similarities and differences between the three groups who studied the PDD course.

2.1. Condensed Teaching Weeks vs. Semester-Long Traditional Courses

As noted by the National Academy of Engineering [17], to maintain economic competitiveness and improve the quality of life for people around the world, engineering educators and curriculum developers need to "anticipate dramatic changes in engineering practice and adapt their programs accordingly." Along these lines, one of the topics of most interest was the effect of the particular method of teaching within the MIT-Portugal Program. The courses are taught simultaneously to students from the three Portuguese universities in a co-located way by a team of MIT faculty and Portuguese faculty from the three Universities involved. Since this was a first experience in PBL for people from remote places working together, it would be too complicated to also introduce distance education as a means at the same time. However, courses in other domains of the MIT-Portugal Program, such as Transportation, already started employing distance education.

Since the universities the students attend are distributed across Portugal, the courses in this program are taught in two condensed periods of one week classes, separated by six weeks without classes. A second reason for the condensed week approach was to involve students in the TME program that would retain their job during the program. In the beginning, this structure was considered potentially disruptive. However, it does reflect current product development practice, which in many cases is conducted on a globalized basis, in which development teams are dispersed around the world [18]. The geographical distribution of the team provided us with a realistic environment useful for PBL and a way of assessing whether this way of developing products has significant implications on the quality of the products, the teamwork or the teaching and learning experience.

2.2. The Product Design and Development Courses and Research Participants

All three PDD courses used the textbook "Product Design and Development" [16] as a foundational resource, but some extra readings were sometimes proposed for some specific topics.

The MIT graduate students studied a project-based semester-long PDD course. Within the EDAM curriculum, the PDD course is part of the Ph.D. and Advanced Study programs. The EDAM PDD course focuses on teamwork, integration of interdisciplinary domain knowledge, with emphasis on system thinking in an industrial setting [19]. The EDAM course was taught by Portuguese faculty from IST, FEUP, and UM, in collaboration with MIT faculty in a condensed schedule with emphasis on project-based learning. This program has a condensed structure. It starts with one-week of intensive lectures, followed by six weeks without lectures. This structure repeats and ends with students' presentations. During their two six-week periods without classes, students have to turn in nine assignments designed to guide them through the product development process, which is adapted to their specific project. Instructors then comment on these assignments individually. Each professor sends his comments independently of the others. This process helps the student teams improve their projects towards the final presentation. After the second six-week period, the students convene for presentations of their projects, in which they also have to show a working prototype and hand in a full report. The third research group – IST and FEUP – took two separate, more traditional, semester-long PDD courses. These two groups were combined because their pedagogical approaches were similar.

About ten EDAM faculty and 116 graduate students participated in this study. The students who responded to the pre-questionnaire consisted of 50 MIT, 25 EDAM, and 41 IST & FEUP students. Figure 1 describes the distribution of these students by their prior academic degrees: B.A. and M.A. or higher.




Figure 1. Graduate students' distribution by their prior academic degree

Comparing the students' distribution by prior academic degrees using Pearson Chi-Square, no significant differences were found between the three research groups. The students were asked to specify their area(s) of expertise and number of experience years in each of those areas. Many students indicated more than a single area of expertise.

Table 1 lists the students' number and percentage of the entire population by their declared areas of expertise. The percentage sum exceeds 100% as students were able to specify more than one area of expertise. The distribution shows that engineering is the most prevalent expertise, followed by management and manufacturing.

Table 1. Students' areas of expertise

Area of Expertise	N	Percent
Engineering	75	60%
Management	66	52%
Manufacturing	51	41%
Industrial Design	36	29%
Other	28	22%

Using Pearson Chi-Square, no significant differences were found between the three research groups with respect to distribution of work experience in any one of the areas, except for engineering. The distribution of engineering work experience, showed that the vast majority of MIT graduate students have three or more years of engineering experience, while most of the Portuguese graduate students (EDAM and IST & FEUP), have less than three years. This difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 25.74, p < 0.0001$). Since the only difference found between graduate MIT and Portuguese students was the engineering work experience, we revisited the distribution of academic degrees. Examining MIT and Portuguese students with respect to their Master degree in engineering, we found a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 20.87, p < 0.005$). There were significantly more MIT students holding a master degree in engineering (80%) than their peers: 40% in EDAM, and 61% in IST & FEUP.

2.3. The Research Tools and Methodology

Research tools included (1) pre- and post-questionnaires, administered to the students of all three research groups, (2) focus groups for EDAM faculty and students, and (3) end-of-semester perception questionnaire. We focus on the analysis of several questions related to students' understanding and perceptions. Questions included describing key PDD concepts and processes, ranking reasons for product success, and identifying team and individual skills required for working on a product development project. In the open-ended questions, students' responses from all three groups were analyzed and the extracted items were grouped into categories. These categories were primarily based on the courses textbook [16] with refinement based on items gleaned from the text written by the students.

The study has employed the qualitative approach in the analysis and interpretation of data. The analysis of the responses to the open-ended questions, focus group transcripts, and end-of-semester perception questionnaire was based on the constructivist and interpretative method [20]. The analysis focused on students' thinking process and on the perceptions of both students and instructors. In order to produce reliable interpretations, data analysis was constructed gradually. The collected data was first read and

processed, listing significant words, phrases, and sentences. We then categorized the data. All responses and transcripts were independently read and interpreted by three experts in engineering and science education. Throughout the analysis process, the suggested categories, views, and insights were examined and discussed, until consensus was reached.

Study corroboration and trustworthiness were established both by methodological and investigator triangulation [20]. Methodological triangulation was obtained by the convergence of data from three sources: (a) responses to close- and open-ended questions, (b) focus groups transcripts, and (c) written perceptions. Investigators triangulation was obtained by having the data jointly analyzed by the three experts.

2.4. Sample Products Resulting from Students' Projects

Examples of the products that the MIT teams developed as part of the PDD course were a battery integrated carry-on bag for frequent business travelers, a medicine dispenser with two compartments, remote keyless door opener, a task management system for blind people living with others, a rechargeable briefcase, and a rack for storing cans and bottles before taking them in for a refund.

Examples of project-based products the EDAM teams developed were "baby bottle anywhere"¹, a portable device to easily carry bags, a soap delivery system to help parents support children's hygiene, and a trash compactor.




Figure 2. Trash Compactor – an example of a product developed by an EDAM team

Figure 2 presents the trash compactor which operates by exerting pressure on the compactor lid. The telescopic body will collapse as the bottles or cans are crushed.

The IST teams developed a device for exploitation of solar energy for glacier refrigeration, a cane with sensors for the blind (Portuguese patent DOM PT 1370), and an orange juicer for children.

Figure 3 presents the cane, which operates by detecting obstacles using an optical proximity sensor. When an obstacle is detected, be it a hole or a protrusion, the cane vibrates. Different vibration frequencies help the user know if the obstacle is a hole or a protrusion.



Figure 3. Cane with sensors for the blind – an example of a product developed by an IST team

FEUP teams developed a solar energy supported baggage, a Web platform for storing medical data, and a social network for elderly people.

3. Findings: Learning Outcomes

The findings of the questionnaire and their analysis are divided into three sections: critical success factors for creating a “good” product, product development activities, and individual and team skills.

¹ a baby bottle nipple that can be attached to any baby food package, dispensing the use of a baby bottle

3.1. Critical Success Factors for Creating a “Good” Product

To analyze changes in students' responses before and after the PDD course, we compared responses to several questions. One of the questions called for ranking critical success factors for a "good" product. Table 2 lists the pre and post average ranking on a 1-5 scale of the entire student population. The score of the post is consistently higher than that of the pre. The highest ranking items in both the pre and the post are fulfillment of (1) the product's intended function and (2) critical customer need. Trend, portability, fair price, and ease of use increased the most (0.7, 0.6, 0.5 and 0.5, respectively). These factors increased the most due to the fact that in the post-questionnaire, the students had to relate these factors to the product they had developed in the PDD course.

Table 2. Students' ranking of a product's critical success factors

	PRE N = 109		POST N = 75	
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.
The product is easy to use	3.8	1.3	4.3	1.0
The product is attractive	3.2	1.5	3.6	1.2
The product is trendy	2.2	1.3	2.9	1.3
The product is novel	2.7	1.5	3.1	1.5
The product's price seems fair	3.5	1.5	4.0	1.1
The product is portable	2.2	1.4	2.8	1.4
The product fulfills its intended function	4.6	0.9	4.6	0.9
The product fulfills a critical customer need	4.3	1.3	4.5	1.0

The next question called for ranking reasons for product success despite failing technical specifications. The pre and post responses for MIT, EDAM, and IST & FEUP are presented in Figure 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6, respectively.




Figure 4. Reasons for product success despite failing technical specifications: MIT graduate students' responses ($N_{pre} = 47$, $N_{post} = 27$)




Figure 5. Reasons for product success despite failing technical specifications: EDAM graduate students' responses ($N_{pre} = 27$, $N_{post} = 21$)




Figure 6. Reasons for product success despite failing technical specifications: IST & FEUP graduate students' responses ($N_{pre} = 35$, $N_{post} = 26$)

Examining the responses, we see that overall, the ranking in the post-questionnaire is higher than that in the pre-questionnaire for all three groups. The highest ranking items for the three groups were "Fulfills its intended function" and "Fulfills a critical need", both ranking above 4. These are followed by ease of use and fair price. "Trendy" and "Novel" are low-ranking items. Statistical analysis of the relative differences from pre to post revealed no significant difference between the three groups for any one of the items. Based on this and the similarity of ranking we conclude that the three groups had similar understanding of the reasons for product success despite technical failures.

3.2. Product Development Activities

We analyzed two questions from the post-questionnaire that were related to product development activities. The first question was: "List the activities that occurred in the development of the product your team carried out." Following is the list of ten categories which emerged as a result of the item analysis and validation by two experts, arranged by the product lifecycle phases: 1. Social interactions – PDD-related team management, face-to-face or electronically-mediated meetings; 2. Planning and brainstorming – including mission statement; 3. Concept development – including generation, selection, improving, and testing; 4. Market research – survey, interview of needs, questionnaires, competitors research; 5. Analysis & design – Project and product analysis, benchmarking, architecture, design; 6. Prototyping – creating a prototype of the product being designed; 7. Prototype testing – including experts or users survey; 8. Product modifications and manufacturing; 9. Business plan and IP – including marketing, patent, and risk; 10. Presentations – students' class presentations of their designed product.

The point score reflect the number of different items we found in each category.

Table 3. Number of product development items listed by students in the post questionnaire

Research Group	N Items	N Students	Items/Student
MIT	218	26	8.38
EDAM	146	17	8.59
IST & FEUP	157	21	7.48
Total	521	64	8.14

The point score reflect the number of different items we found in each category.

Table 3 presents the number of product development items listed by students in the post questionnaire and shows that overall students provided detailed responses. MIT and EDAM students listed on average a higher number of items than that of the IST & FEUP students. Since the items relate to the various stages of the product life cycle, a higher ratio of items per student indicates that the student has internalized the stages by engaging in their actual performance. Thus, it is a way of assessing the level of learning that took place. The MIT and EDAM students scored higher in items per student, indicating profound learning. This is also one indication of the effectiveness of the project-based learning approach compared with the more traditional approach used for teaching the IST & FEUP groups. The close equivalence of the MIT and EDAM students indicates that the "concentrated" curriculum in EDAM is quite effective (perhaps even more than the standard approach because the MIT students had more engineering experience). We found out that the two highest-ranking categories students listed were market research and concept development. These were followed by prototyping, analysis & design, and business plan & IP.




Figure 7. Distribution of product development categories in the post questionnaire by research group
 Comparing the distribution of categories in Figure 7 by the three research groups, we see that overall the pattern is similar, but there are some interesting differences. MIT students were more inclined to mention later product lifecycle phases, such as prototyping, prototype testing and modification, than their Portuguese peers. This has led to a more balanced approach to product development, in which every phase of the process gets proper attention.

EDAM students were more focused on early stages of concept development and market research, as well as on later stages of writing a business plan and attending to IP issues. This focus is a result of the way the assignments were designed. During the first four weeks of the course (of which the first is devoted to intensive lectures), most of the basic concepts are introduced, and the students work intensively on them, with awareness of business aspects from the outset. In the second half of the semester, the workload decreases somewhat as the students approach the business plan preparation and final presentation.

Analyzing the influence of the course structure of condensed weeks of classes followed by periods without formal class meetings, we concluded that this had no effect on the overall performance of students. The percentage of time spent on social interactions is similar to that of the MIT students and higher than that of the IST & FEUP students.

The fact that the students stayed for a full week at the same location, in the same hotel, working intensively on their project is in itself a team building experience. This helped them communicate when they were dispersed later, during the two six-week periods without class meetings. Although not explicitly asked in the questionnaire, in some informal discussions of the authors with the students, students indicated that most of their interaction during this six-week break was frequent, using email and Skype. The students acknowledged, however, that this working mode was made possible only after the team members had gotten to know each other well enough to freely use electronic means of communication. The faculty feedback on the students' assignments is also done electronically. Every assignment is graded and commented by the faculty during the two six-weeks periods without classes.

Comparing the MIT and EDAM students to the IST & FEUP students, we see that Analysis & Design was highest for IST & FEUP students. This may be a side effect of the background of these students. About half of them have a mechanical engineering background, where analysis is a key factor to their success in college. On average their work experience is limited (see Figure 2), so they rely on what they learn in the course to ensure that their project progresses as it should. This is also reflected later on in their lack of commitment to prototyping and prototype testing, an unfamiliar area for them, and one that is also not emphasized in the traditional course syllabus or the assignments schedule.

The attention to Business Plan and IP is critical for all of the Portuguese students. Both IST and EDAM students were mindful of IP issues, but in different ways: IST students filed a relatively large number of patents while EDAM students were encouraged to search extensively for prior patents that could impinge on their proposed products. MIT students were not encouraged to file patents, although IP issues were mentioned in the course. These differences in IP-related foci are reflected in Figure 7.

The second question related to product development activities, which focused on marketing, was: "List in descending order of importance three activities that you would carry out in order to market and promote your product." Since the question was open-ended, we analyzed the students' free text responses by setting categories, validating them, and classifying the items gleaned from the responses into these categories.

The overall response pattern of the three research groups was similar. The similarity was most apparent between MIT and EDAM. This again indicates very similar learning experiences in the very different learning modes. On the other hand, IST & FEUP students place more emphasis on campaigns and advertising using in particular electronic media. IST and FEUP students have market research and supply and demand chain partnership scores lower than those of their MIT and EDAM peers. From a product development perspective, IST & FEUP students rely more on downstream commitment from marketing campaigns than on upstream market studies or on integrating product development with strategic decisions from the company. These differences can be attributed to the fact that IST & FEUP courses were mostly theory-oriented and lacked practice in being engaged in an industry-like environment.

3.3. Individual and Team Skills

The questionnaire included two open-ended questions related to individual and team skills. The first question, aimed at understand students' views on team skills necessary to develop successful products, was phrased as follows: *“What two most important TEAM skills are required while working on a product development project?”* Figure 8 presents the results. In this question, as in the previous one, the IST & FEUP group deviated from the similar pattern exhibited by the MIT and EDAM groups. IST & FEUP students estimated the importance of project management and organization, which is a critical topic in developing new products, to a lesser extent than their MIT and EDAM peers. In the pre-course questionnaire, creativity and open-mindedness were ranked by the IST & FEUP group higher than by MIT and EDAM. This likely is due to differences in these students' backgrounds. Indeed, as Table 1 shows, IST & FEUP students included designers and architects, who are typically known to consider these traits as important more than engineers do. In IST, creativity is especially emphasized, and an entire lecture is devoted to this subject, a fact that probably contributed to these differences between the groups.




Figure 8. Distribution of team skills in the post questionnaire by research group

Similar to the first question, but relating to the individual skills as opposed to team skills, the second was as follows: *“What two most important INDIVIDUAL skills are required while working on a product development project?”* The results of the analysis of students' responses to this question, indicated substantial differences between the three research groups. It seems that IST & FEUP students misunderstood the term “individual skills” within a product development team, taking it to mean individuality or individualism. IST & FEUP students indicated engineering skills as being important more than twice as many times as their MIT and EDAM peers. This too can be explained by the difference in the groups' professional composition – IST & FEUP students lacked professional engineering experience and therefore emphasized the need for it at the expense of teamwork, as they felt lack of engineering experience during their project work.

An interesting difference exists in the view of EDAM students on originality, creativity and open-mindedness between the team and the individual. The students attribute this skill almost entirely to the individual and not to the team. The pattern for MIT students, while similar, is less drastic. For IST & FEUP students there is hardly any difference between originality, creativity and open-mindedness of the team and

the individual. It is suspected that these results (more than other differences between groups found in the study) reflect cultural differences between Portuguese and American students.

4. Perceptions of Students and Faculty

Students and faculty perceptions were gathered from two sources. The post-questionnaire contained a question in which students were asked to list advantages and disadvantages of the project-based learning approach (for MIT graduates) and of the EDAM program (for EDAM graduates) in respect to their PDD courses. The second source was focus groups with EDAM students and faculty. Examples of MIT and EDAM students' responses are provided below.

4.1. MIT Students' Perceptions

MIT students provided several insights into the contribution of project-based learning to their career. One student said: *"I think that project-based is the best way to learn in PDD class as it leads students to think about how to apply the knowledge in the project. Lecture-only approach will not be beneficial if we don't have to work on any project in class."* Advantages listed by another student included: *"Apply the classroom directly to the project. [We gained] real hands on experience and outside the normal job description. Liked getting hands dirty, and going out to field."* Yet another student provided additional benefits: *"[We] go through a complete cycle of development; Hands on experiences with each activity and their importance."*

The combination of teacher- and student-centered approaches was well received: *"Frontal lecture-only approach was useful when we learn something new such as concept generation or selection methods. On the other hand, project-based learning approach made us stay active throughout the entire semester. Also the experience that we learned from our project gave us a very clear connection to the knowledge that we learned from lectures."*

Main disadvantages students noted included: (1) *"There was a huge learning curve that took a lot time for the project... [We] wanted to learn material better, but [were] focused too much on project."* (2) *"[We] spend too much time on the actual prototyping phase. Does it add to the learning experiences? Only skim through each phase so no deep learning experiences."* (3) *"Different time schedule (difficult to manage sometimes) - Some team member commitment - Differences in expectation."*

4.2. EDAM Students' Perceptions

EDAM students were more articulate, intertwining the positive and negative aspects of the condensed program. One wrote that for students who keep their day job this format is the best but highly demanding: *"The intensive lecturing periods are the best for those (like me) that have a job during the EDAM program. But the Saturday with classes is very difficult to manage because we are all week out of house and we have a family and children to take care. By the other side the full-term lecturing allow us to organize very well all the work, because in the intensive lecturing periods we have to[o] much work to deliver at the same time... [Need] a well organize schedule between courses for deliver[ing assignments]."*

Other students commented on reading materials: (1) *"I think this method is quite good even though sometimes I have a hard time keeping up with the pace when there are a lot of things to read and prepare. Nonetheless that's something I have to improve and not something the program has to change. What I dislike in this method... if there's a good chance that the persons on the class already heard about a given subject, it's preferable to give a case study approach..."* We note that, even in classes that take place during 15 consecutive weeks, reading is a problematic issue especially for graduate students who keep working in the industry during the course.

A Ph.D. student discussed acquired skills and project-based learning even though this was not directly asked: *"The intensive lectures are a good opportunity to develop our skills to plan, organize and study the materials before the lessons... I can be more effective and focused in my work...The students need to express their thoughts more effectively, perhaps with more visual thinking. The role of concurrent development of the projects (or thesis) is an excellent way to learn new knowledge (project based learning)..."*

4.3. Perceptions of EDAM Faculty

During November 2008, EDAM Faculty from three universities, IST, FEUP, and Minho, met one of the authors in Portugal. They were asked to comment on advantages and disadvantages of the EDAM

program's intermittent lecture structure, and to compare it with the typical full-term lecturing structure they teach in other programs. Some of their responses, quoted below, indicate that this unique format has the advantage of getting commitment from faculty as well as students. Faculty D noted:

"I find this lecturing scheme very good for me. I did not get relieved from my previous lecturing duties in my "normal" courses [at the university], so the intensive lecturing of EDAM minimizes the disturbance with the other... three different courses [I teach] besides EDAM. This political compromise of going from one university to the next to teach the several week lectures turned out to be very good in terms of commitment from faculty, since we need to move with the students when the lectures do not take place at our home institution, so we [faculty] also spend time that is totally devoted to the course we are teaching, with minimum interruption from other issues – it's a 'mini-sabbatical', if you wish to call it that..."

Faculty G added the students' perspective:

"I think that the one intense week has the advantage of the students being completely concentrated in the program, and not disperse with their company problems. The fact that they are away from their job place is also very important for their success in the program. This is not common in the Portuguese system... but after a period students will find great advantages in this system..."

Another advantage of the non-consecutive learning pattern was pointed out by faculty L: "... It allows re-discussion of the topics of the first lecturing period after a reflection on it or its implementation, define more structured assignments, promote team working during the assignments... and it minimizes faculty [schedule] conflicts."

Linking academia with industry was raised as an advantage by faculty T: "...the main advantage is the bridge between industry and university. The time used during the semester is very concentrated in two hard weeks. It is difficult for the students from the industry to get all the assignments on time. PhD students are more invested in the learning but they [the professors] try to combine them [full time students with those who have jobs in industry] together. The contact between the students and the faculty is very short and sometimes [it] is not easy to understand clearly what the real work of the students is."

One concern EDAM faculty mentioned was overload, as faculty O. noted: "*They (the faculty) are doing everything as before, but in addition... they also teach PDD in collaboration with other faculty because it is [an] interdisciplinary program and requires more expertise. The load is much higher for EDAM than for a regular.*"

5. Summary and Conclusions

This study assessed the PDD course within the MIT-Portugal Program. The research questions were to investigate the PDD EDAM course in the context of two other groups who studied the PDD course – MIT and IST & FEUP. The MIT students studied a project-based semester-long PDD course. The EDAM students took an intensive modular course, taught in a condensed schedule with emphasis on project-based learning. The other group from Portugal took a more traditional, semester-long course.

While we found similarities among the different student populations in a number of areas, there were also some interesting differences. The three groups had similar understandings of the reasons for product success despite technical failures, and they all ranked highest the following items: 'the product fulfills its intended function' and 'the product fulfills a critical need'. In an open-ended question related to the various stages of the product life cycle MIT and EDAM students listed on average a higher number of items than that of the IST & FEUP students. A higher ratio of items per student indicates that the student has internalized the stages by engaging in their actual performance. Thus, it is a way of assessing the level of learning that took place.

The findings obtained from the focus groups and the end-of-course perception questionnaire and the fact that the EDAM students' responses were closer to those of the MIT students indicate that the PDD course has had a positive impact on the EDAM students. The unorthodox lecturing scheme of two one-week intensive classes with a six-week break caused no major disturbance in student learning. Indeed, there are some indications that it might be superior to conventional academic practice and further exploration of this concept in other settings is recommended. Teamwork did not suffer from having to carry out the assignments by geographically dispersed team members, but the need of team members to know each other in person prior to the beginning of the teamwork has been found to be critical. Hoegl and colleagues [21] found that effective teamwork is paramount if the distance between team members increases. Furthermore, if the team can achieve a high level of teamwork over distance, a low-proximity team can attain a higher level of effectiveness and efficiency than a co-located team for the same tasks. In general, this mode of

teaching more closely matches some aspects of professional practice and thus matches with the goals of PBL. This finding also presents an opportunity for potentially improving remote teams' effectiveness in new product development that should be further explored. In particular, it would be of interest and importance to explore the extent to which multi-cultural teams can create effective teamwork that relies on information and communication technologies, without face-to-face meetings, as this would mimic the increasingly deployed mode of remote work in large, multinational corporations.

The formation of teams in EDAM with a mix of technology (LTI) and management (TME) students also seemed to work well. A mix of some industrial experience with fresh scientific knowledge was noticeable in the project outcomes, and students learned a lot from the experience of working with peers with diversified backgrounds. The questionnaires revealed differences in terms of cultural, professional, and educational background. This was also found by [22], who compared different teams in different countries on issues related to the perceived success of new product development in the context of higher education in technology management.

Engineers face design tasks that are growing in complexity, demanding knowledge skills that cut across several traditional knowledge boundaries. These design problems call for broad-based collaboration skills. Researchers [23] found that there are learning barriers stemming from students failing to recognize the relationship between their own discipline and an interdisciplinary subject of study and failing to recognize and value the contributions of multiple technical and non-technical fields to a given interdisciplinary problem. Overall, however, our observation was that MIT and EDAM students were able to overcome this difficulty. Students' achievements in their learning tasks depends, in part, on the match between the teaching pedagogy and the learning processes students experience in their courses [24]. Many studies on higher education confirmed the benefits of student active learning and engagement [25, 26]. Prince [27] noted that the most important student engagement in active learning setting was the personal interaction, both among students and between faculty and students.

The project-based learning approach that follows the MIT PDD course example has been instrumental in successfully incorporating hands-on activities and students-faculty interactions into the formerly teacher-centered Portuguese approach.

Researchers [28] have emphasized the importance of team coaching and its relevance when teams are formed of individuals that are very different in their cultures, languages, and/or backgrounds. To some extent, the EDAM PDD students are different in all three elements. EDAM PDD faculty must consider themselves as the students' coaches. This additional role requires extra time and effort to provide students with periodic and timely feedback on students' assignments during the two six-week periods, and toward the end—on the students' final projects. Authentic learning processes normally require a certain level of effort, and this is true for both students and teachers. However, specific measures will have to be taken in order to avoid excessive overloading of both the students and the teachers of the MIT-Portugal Program [29]. Reflecting on the EDAM team mission statement, as specified by Magee and colleagues [2], the EDAM PDD course is one important step in advancing the new educational engineering paradigm in Europe in general and in Portugal in particular. This innovative program and its unique curriculum help promote a new attitude towards entrepreneurship, knowledge-based manufacturing, and competitive product development.

In conclusion, as the National Engineering Education Research Colloquies [30] noted, successful studies in engineering education are expected to be comprised of multidisciplinary teams of engineers and other fields in order to bring their expertise to this emerging field of research. Indeed, the research team who carried out this study consisted of science education and engineering experts from two different universities in different countries. Just as it has been found valuable to involve interdisciplinary teams of students, our research has demonstrated that there is merit in collaboration among faculty from different countries with various backgrounds and disciplines. This seems to be an adequate response to the globalization challenge engineers face, as pointed to by Vest [1].

In addition, PBL approach that was used in the PDD EDAM project can be used also as a basis for distance and e-Learning technologies to help graduate students from other countries increase their access to quality university education for a larger percentage of the population. Further longitudinal studies are needed (a) to strengthen our experience and claim that there is benefit in creating multidisciplinary teams of both students and faculty and (b) to investigate the PBL approach with distance and e-Learning technologies and multi-culture teams.

Acknowledgement

The first author acknowledges the MIT-Portugal Program for the financial support of this research. We also thank all the involved faculty, staff, and students for their cooperation throughout the research. We thank Dr. Orit Herscovitz for validating the qualitative analysis, and Dr. Miri Barak, Dr. Josh Jacobs, and Prof. Chris Magee for their valuable comments on the final draft.

References

- [1] Vest, C. 2008. Context and challenge for twenty-first century engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97(7): 235-236.
- [2] Magee, C. L., Ringo, J. D., and Cunha, A. M. 2008. Engineering design and product development: a focus of the MIT- Portugal Programme. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 24(2), 336-344.
- [3] Mills, J. E. and Treagust, D. F. 2003-4. Engineering education – is problem-based or project-based learning the answer? *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, online publication.
http://www.aeee.com.au/journal/2003/mills_treagust03.pdf
- [4] Thomas, J.W. 2000. A review of research on project-based learning. Autodesk Foundation. Retrieved August 2009: http://www.ri.net/middletown/mef/linksresources/documents/researchreviewPBL_070226.pdf
- [5] Dutton, A.J., Todd, R.H., Magleby, S.P., and Sorensen, C.D. 1997. A review of literature on reaching design through project-oriented capstone courses. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 76(1): 17-28.
- [6] Dym, C., Agogino, A., Eris, O., Frey, D., Leifer, L. 2005. Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1):103-120.
- [7] Smith, K.A., Sheppard, S.D., Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. 2005. Pedagogies of engagement: Classroom-based practices. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1):1-15.
- [8] Thurgut, H. 2008. Prospective science teachers' conceptualizations about project based learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 1(1): 61-79.
- [9] Barak, M. and Dori, Y.J. (2005). Enhancing undergraduate students' chemistry understanding through project-based learning in an IT environment. *Science Education*, 89(1): 117-139.
- [10] Crawley, E. F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S. and Brodeur, D. 2007. *Rethinking Engineering Education: the CDIO approach*. Springer, Berlin.
- [11] Dori, Y.J. 2007. Educational reform at MIT: Advancing and evaluating technology-based projects on- and off-campus. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 16(4): 279-281.
- [12] Silva, A., E. Henriques, and Carvalho, A. 2009. Creativity enhancement in a product development course through entrepreneurship learning and intellectual property awareness. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 34(1), 63-75.
- [13] Atman, C. J., Chimka, J. R. and et al. 1999. A comparison of freshman and senior engineering design processes. *Design Studies*, 20(2), 131-152.
- [14] Atman, C. J., Cardella, M. E. and et al. 2005. Comparing freshman and senior engineering design processes: an in-depth follow-up study. *Design Studies*, 26(4), 325-357.
- [15] Adams, R. S., Turns, J. and Atman, C.J. 2003. Educating effective engineering designers: the role of reflective practice. *Design Studies*, 24(3): 275-294.
- [16] Ulrich, K.T. and Eppinger, S.D. 2008. *Product Design and Development*, Fourth Edition, McGraw Hill, New York, NY.
- [17] NAE, 2009. The National Academy of Engineering. *The Engineer of 2020: Visions of Engineering in the New Century*. Retrieved August 2009. <http://www.nae.edu/nae/naepcms.nsf/weblinks/MKEZ-5Z5PKL?OpenDocument>
- [18] Eppinger, S. D. and Chitkara, A. R. 2006. The new practice of global product development. *Sloan Management Review*, 47(4): 22-30.
- [19] Silva, A., Henriques, E., Fontul, M., and Faria, L. 2009. On some innovative aspects of the EDAM MIT-Portugal Program. *Proceedings of the Second International Engineering Systems Symposium on Engineering Systems: Achievements and Challenges*, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts, June 15-17.
- [20] Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research in: Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.). (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage publications, Inc.
- [21] Hoegl, M., Ernst, H., and Proserpio, L. 2007. How teamwork matters more as team member dispersion increases. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 24(2), 156-165.
- [22] Ettl, J. E. 2002. Research-based pedagogy for new product development: MBA's versus engineers in different countries. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 19(1): 46-53.
- [23] Richter, D. M., and Paretti, M. C. 2009. Identifying barriers to and outcomes of interdisciplinarity in the engineering classroom. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 34(1), 29 - 45.
- [24] Felder, R. M. and Brent, R. 2005. Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1): 57-72.
- [25] Barak, M., Lipson, A. and Lerman, S. (2006). Wireless laptops as means for promoting active learning in large lecture halls. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 38(3), 245-264.

- [26] Dori, Y.J. and Belcher, J.W. 2005. How does technology-enabled active learning affect students' understanding of scientific concepts? *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 14(2): 243-279.
- [27] Prince, M. 2004. Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3): 223-321.
- [28] Reich, Y., Ullmann, G., Van der Loos, M., and Leifer, L. 2009. Coaching product development teams: a conceptual foundation for empirical studies. *Research in Engineering Design*, 19(4): 205-222.
- [29] Dori, Y.J. 2009. Assessing the product development & design courses within the MIT Portugal Program. *Proceedings of the Second International Engineering Systems Symposium on Engineering Systems: Achievements and Challenges*, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 15-17.
- [30] National Engineering Education Research Colloquies. 2006. Special report: The research agenda for the new discipline of engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95 (4): 259-61.