The Montana MULE:

A Case Study In Interdisciplinary Capstone Design

Brock J. LaMeres, Ph.D., PE Assistant Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering

Hunter Lloyd Faculty, Computer Science

Robb Larson, PE Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering Technology

Ahsan Mian, Ph.D. Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering



College of **ENGINEERING**



Overview



- In May of 2010, NASA conducted the first annual *Lunabotics Mining Competition* at the Kennedy Space Center.
- This event was put on by the NASA ESMD Higher Education Project with the intent to

"retain students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM)"

- This report details the design process of the Montana MULE (<u>Modular Unmanned Lunar</u> <u>Excavator</u>) and the NASA Lunabotics competition. Further, it highlights the pedagogical impact of this project on the capstone curriculum in the MSU college of engineering.
- The Montana MULE took <u>First Place</u> in the mining competition delivering 21.6kg of regolith simulant

and

won the <u>Joe Kosmo Award for Excellence</u> given to the team with the most overall competition points.







Competition Overview



- Students were to design a wireless-controlled robot to excavate lunar regolith simulant.
- The robot had 15 minutes to collect the regolith and deposit as much as possible into a collector.
- A minimum of 10kg of regolith needed to be deposited into the collector to qualify. The team with the most regolith deposited above 10kg wins.
- Limits were put on the size, mass, and technology.





Sandbox Diagram (side view)

Sandbox Diagram (top view)





Competition Overview



• What it really looked like...

The sandbox was housed in a ventilated tent.

Tyvex suits and ventilation masks had to be worn inside the tent to prevent contact with the regolith

The robot was controlled form an isolated room with a camera feed



(Chris Ching)





(Paul Dallapiazza, Steve Pemble, Ben Hogenson)



(Jack Ritter, Chris Ching, Jenny Hane)





Competition Overview

NASA had a set of required and optional deliverables throughout the project.

<u>Required</u>

- Systems Engineering Paper
- Outreach Report

Optional

- Slide Presentation
- Team Spirit Competition
- Digital Video of Design Process
- Collaboration with a minority serving inst.
- Forming a interdisciplinary team
- Each of these elements could be completed for points. These points were combined with points received from the mining competition to form an overall point total. The overall point leader received the <u>Joe Kosmo Award for Excellence.</u>





(due 4/15/10) (at event) (due 5/25/10)

(due 4/15/10)

(due 4/15/10)



Interdisciplinary Capstone Logistics MONTANA

- MSU formed a team to participate in the competition. The design was completed as part of the students capstone.
- The Montana MULE team consisted of 8 students from 4 different departments



Ben Hogenson	(EE)
Jennifer Hane	(EE)
Phillip Karls	(EE)
Chris Ching	(CS)
Steve Pemble	(MET)
Craig Harne	(MET)
John Ritter	(ME)
Paul Dallapiazza	(ME)

(Pemble, Dallapiazza, Ching, Hane, Hogenson, Harne, Ritter)

• An Advisor from each department supervised their respective groups (ECE, CS, ME, MET)





College of

ENGINEERING

Interdisciplinary Capstone Logistics MONTANA

• This was a 2 semester project. Coordinating the capstones between departments was a challenge.

Electrical Team

- ECE has a 1 semester capstone. 3 students designed the electrical system as their capstone.

- 2 students continued on the project during the 2nd semester. 1 student received undergraduate thesis credit for the effort. 1 student received a \$750 undergraduate research fellowship from MSU for the effort.



(Karls, Hogenson, Hane)

Mechanical Team

- ME/MET has a 2 semester capstone. 2 ME and 2 MET students designed the mechanical system as their capstone.

- The ME/MET capstone matched the Lunabotics schedule the best.



(Pemble, Ritter, Dallapiazza, Harne)

Computer Team

College of

ENGINEERING

- CS has a 1 semester, optional capstone for interdisciplinary minor students only. 1 CS student participated in this project as his capstone.

- The first semester the CS student did not receive credit. The second semester the student received 3 credits.



(Ching)





Design Process



 In September 2009, the entire team began with brainstorming conceptual designs and trading off requirements. All fabrication was completed at MSU

Electrical Team

- Power Distribution, Motor Control







Mechanical System

- Locomotion, Digging, Dumping





- Wireless Networking, Control Algorithm.











<u>Testing</u>

- The mechanical system was tested without the control electronics using a relay switch box. This allowed all of the mechanical systems to be verified. The testing was conducted in a volleyball course at MSU.



(Hogenson, Hane, Dallapiazza, Ritter, Pemble, Ching, Harne)



(Hogenson, Ching, Pemble, Dallapiazza, Ritter)





Outreach Events



- As part of the NASA requirements, an outreach report needed to be turned in. The team gave 5 outreach presentations and made a highlight video for use in student recruiting.
 - <u>Event Ex</u> Presentation to 30 students from Mrs. Theide's 4th grade class from Morning Star Elementary School.





Competition Event



 In May of 2010, Dr. LaMeres and 6 students traveled to NASA's Kennedy Space Center to participate in the 1st annual Lunabotics Mining Competition.

The students on the travel team were:



Craig Harne and Phillip Karls could not attend due to already working in industry.

• The competition was held at the Astronaut Hall of Fame.







Competition Event



• **Local Support :** Prior to leaving for the competition, the University and local news picked up the story about a student team going to NASA for a robot competition.







Shipping

- 22 teams from across the nation participated in the mining competition.
- MSU traveled the furthest distance. The robot was shipped to the Kennedy Space Center the week prior to the event.



(Ben Hogenson and Steve Pemble fasten down the MULE in a custom crate)



(Jenny Hane, Steve Pemble, and Ben Hogenson stand by the sealed crate)



(The MULE and its crate weight for the shipping truck to arrive on the MSU loading dock)







Practice Day

- Each team was given a trial run in the sandbox prior to the official competition days.
- Very few robots moved. The MULE was one of them.



(Jenny Hane and Ben Hogenson try to get the motor controller electronics turned on)



(Steve Pemble, Ben Hogenson, and Paul Dallapiazza lift the MULE into the sandbox for its practice run)



(Chris Ching comes into the sandbox from the control room trying to figure out why it didn't move)







<u>Competition Day #1</u>

- The MULE was called late in the afternoon for its competition run. No team had dumped any regolith and very few robots even moved.



- The MULE moved, the buckets spun, and the hopper could dump

BUT.....

a broken wire prevented the digging head from actuating and getting the buckets into the regolith.





<u>Competition Day #2</u>

- All wires were checked and the MULE made its 2nd competition attempt.
- Still, no other team had put any regolith in the collector....



- It was loaded......It moved.....It dug.....





Competition Event



<u>Competition Day #2</u>





- It dumped. 21.6kg !!!!!!!









- In the end, no other team was able to dump the required 10kg of regolith.



MSU News Service Article May 29, 2010



Competition Event



THE BIG SKY SATURDAY, MAY 29, 2010 **MSU robot moon-digger wins NASA competition**

BOZEMAN DAILY CHRONICLE

By MICHAEL BECKER Chronicle Staff Writer

A robot moon-digger designed by Montana State University engineering students bested 21 other robots in a competition at Kennedy Space Center on Friday, earning the student team \$5,000 and an invitation to a NASA

rocket launch. The Lunar Regolith Excavator Student Competition was held at the Astronaut Hall of Fame in Florida on Thursday and Friday The 120-pound, 5-foot-tall robot was designed last fall by eight students from three MSU engineering departments. It was built and tested on campus over the past year.

and featured teams from univer-45 pounds. The MSU robot was sities around the country. the only one at the competition The goal: to see which studentto meet NASA's 10-kilogram designed and built, remote-con-trolled robot could pick up the minimum, said the team's faculty adviser, MSU professor Brock most simulated moon dust. The MSU robot, dubbed Mon-LaMeres.

tana MULE, picked up about

22 kilograms of dust - roughly

"They're freaking out. It's incredible," he said. "We went built and tested on campus over the past year. third, so we'd been sitting here for The students will split the

The 120-pound, 5-foot-tall

\$5,000 prize and will get V.LP. seating at a future NASA launch, LaMeres said. The competition was in-tended as part of an effort to keep university students around the country enrolled in science.

I don't know how long, six hours, engineering and mathematwaiting while other teams went ics courses, according to the its website. NASA also hopes that robot was designed last fall by cight students from three MSU the students will come up with innovative ideas that could be engineering departments. It was used on future moon missions. Michael Becker can be reached at 582-2657 or becker@dailychronicle.com.



MONTANA

MSU News Service

MSU robot digs most "moon dirt," wins NASA contest at Kennedy Space Center

May 28, 2010 - By Frehm Romell, MSU News Service

robot from Auburn University dag 6.6 kilograms. The Universit diana's robot dag 2.4 kilograms. Montana MULE was the only s

om Belerade, an MSU senior in compute

Ching and LaN allotment on T aid MSU also benefitted from some extra pro



		LINE 1 2010
BELONDE NONS	JUNE 1, 2010	The second se
MSU studen moon dirt-d	ts win NASA igging contest	continued from page 8 Ritter of Mako Palls, Maho said the scores refreshed at a 5 which means there save logs 5 what he was dring and severe "It was pretty more wrach said. Load cherers and applease i
American de la comparación de	阳	a. VALDA that show related when their related to the conserts of a them related to the conserts of a them related to the conserts of a them related to the conserts of a short. The competition is logar. A first test set of the set of the relation is the set of the relative statistical the competition of the relation of the set of the set of the set statistical the competition of the relative set of the set of the reason information and the set of the reason information and the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the reason information of the set of the set of the set of the set of the reason of the set of the reason of the set of the reason of the set of the set of the set of the
<section-header><section-header><text><text><text></text></text></text></section-header></section-header>	<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>	Beibery das regit. Lot for any order to the second seco









What did this Cost?



What did this experience cost?

\$4,200 Materials & Supplies - Mechanical System (\$1,650) - Electrical System (\$2,050) - Computer System (used existing HW) - Printing & Media (\$500) **Travel** \$8,900 - Airfare (\$4,200) - Motel (\$2,050) - Rental Car (\$600) - Per Diems & Miscellaneous (\$2,050) Shipping \$2,100 **Faculty Support** \$11,300 - salary + fringe benefits \$26,500 **Total**





Lessons Learned (#1)



- Challenges with Different Capstone Deliverables
 - Everyone agrees an interdisciplinary design experience is greatly beneficial to students.
 - But rarely do departments have common capstone structures
 - Competition projects often have an additional set of deliverables
- Recommendations?
 - Can departments agree on a common set of deliverables for interdisciplinary projects?
 - Can departments come up with an interdisciplinary capstone track?
 - Can the academic deliverables be matched to the competitions deliverables for these types of projects?







Lessons Learned (#2)



Challenges with Schedule Coordination

- There is an inherent schedule conflict with students from different departments trying to coordinate times to meet.

- Interdepartmental schedules have evolved to avoid time conflicts as much as possible, but this becomes impractical when considering multiple departments.

Recommendations?

- After hour meetings?
- Student-only meetings?

- There is great value in a full team meeting with respect to accountability. Can faculty attend afterhours meetings?







Lessons Learned (#3)



Faculty Support

- Interdisciplinary projects take more effort from the faculty.
- There is greater coordination and one or two faculty often need to take the role of "prime advisor"



- Competitions put an even greater strain on the faculty and can approach a time commitment similar to a full research project.

- Faculty advisors for capstones are often volunteers (or volun-told) and receive no "credit" for their effort.

- Burning out faculty leads to a sustainability of larger, high impact projects.

Recommendations?

- Can faculty receive "credit" for their effort in the form of summer support or additional compensation?

- Can faculty receive "credit" for their effort in the form of teaching assignment credit?





Lessons Learned (#4)



Fund Raising

- Interdisciplinary projects tend to cost more than traditional mono-department projects.
- Competition projects can cost considerably more when travel is considered (\$20k+)
- Should faculty spend time fund raising?

Recommendations?

- Can institutional support be committed to long term?
- Can foundations be used to form interdisciplinary capstone endowments?







Lessons Learned (#5)



Sustainability

- Large, Interdisciplinary projects (particularly competition designs) tend to start off strong. Perhaps due to the "new car smell"?

- These projects can dwindle in subsequent years due to faculty burn-out and lack of continuing funds.

Recommendations?

- Without some type of institutional support, it is unlikely to sustain these types of projects.
- Can university funds be targeted at strategic projects that are high impact?

- Each successfully, large interdisciplinary project (particularly competition designs) tend to have a primary advisor that drives the success. These prime advisors need to be compensated in some manner in order to keep them engaged.





Conclusion



- Each student on the Montana MULE team said more than once that this was the single most valuable experience they had during their time at MSU.
- Being able to apply what they've learned in the class room to a real design project is what capstones are meant for. An interdisciplinary design project forces the students to communicate across departmental boundaries.
- The NASA event allows the students to feel the pressure of competition.
- It also allows the students to see students at other universities did and gain confidence that their education has prepared them for successfully careers.









Go Cats!!!



Go MULE!!!



