WHAT STUDENTS DO: Establishing Communication Procedures

Following Curiosity on Mars often means roving to places with interesting materials to study, places away from the initial landing site. In this lesson, students experience the processes involved in engineering a communication protocol. To reach their goal, students must create a calibrated solution within constraints and parameters of communicating with a rover on Mars. In this collection, this activity continues to build students’ understanding of engineering design in pursuit of scientific objectives.

NRC CORE & COMPONENT QUESTIONS

HOW DO ENGINEERS SOLVE PROBLEMS?
NRC Core Question: ETS1: Engineering Design

What is a design for? What are the criteria and constraints of a successful solution?
NRC ETS1.A: Defining & Delimiting an Engineering Problem

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Students will be able

IO1: to produce an engineering design that meets goals within constraints
1.0 About This Activity

This activity is part of the Imagine Mars Project, co-sponsored by NASA and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). The Imagine Mars Project is a hands-on, STEM-based project that asks students to work with NASA scientists and engineers to imagine and to design a community on Mars using science and technology, then express their ideas through the arts and humanities, integrating 21st Century skills. The Imagine Mars Project enables students to explore their own community and decide which arts-related, scientific, technological, and cultural elements will be important on Mars. Then, they develop their concepts relating to a future Mars community from an interdisciplinary perspective of the arts, sciences, and technology. imaginemars.jpl.nasa.gov

The Imagine Mars lessons leverage A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). This taxonomy provides a framework to help organize and align learning objectives, activities, and assessments. The taxonomy has two dimensions. The first dimension, cognitive process, provides categories for classifying lesson objectives along a continuum, at increasingly higher levels of thinking; these verbs allow educators to align their instructional objectives and assessments of learning outcomes to an appropriate level in the framework in order to build and support student cognitive processes. The second dimension, knowledge, allows educators to place objectives along a scale from concrete to abstract. By employing Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) taxonomy, educators can better understand the construction of instructional objectives and learning outcomes in terms of the types of student knowledge and cognitive processes they intend to support. All activities provide a mapping to this taxonomy in the Teacher Guide (at the end of this lesson), which carries additional educator resources. Combined with the aforementioned taxonomy, the lesson design also draws upon Miller, Linn, and Gronlund's (2009) methods for (a) constructing a general, overarching, instructional objective with specific, supporting, and measurable learning outcomes that help assure the instructional objective is met, and (b) appropriately assessing student performance in the intended learning-outcome areas through rubrics and other measures. Construction of rubrics also draws upon Lanz's (2004) guidance, designed to measure science achievement.

How Students Learn: Science in the Classroom (Donovan & Bransford, 2005) advocates the use of a research-based instructional model for improving students’ grasp of central science concepts. Based on conceptual-change theory in science education, the 5E Instructional Model (BSCS, 2006) includes five steps for teaching and learning: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. The Engage stage is used like a traditional warm-up to pique student curiosity, interest, and other motivation-related behaviors and to assess students’ prior knowledge. The Explore step allows students to deepen their understanding and challenges existing preconceptions and misconceptions, offering alternative explanations that help them form new schemata. In Explain, students communicate what they have learned, illustrating initial conceptual change. The Elaborate phase gives students the opportunity to apply their newfound knowledge to novel situations and supports the reinforcement of new schemata or its transfer. Finally, the Evaluate stage serves as a time for students’ own formative assessment, as well as for educators’ diagnosis of areas of confusion and differentiation of further instruction. This five-part sequence is the organizing tool for the Imagine Mars instructional series. The 5E stages can be cyclical and iterative.
2.0 Materials

Required Materials

Please supply:

- 3 blindfolds per team of 6 students (if worried about sanitary conditions, simply ask students to close their eyes while being a rover)
- 2 clipboards and pencils per team - 1 for each team driver and official
- Flat obstacles to represent surface rocks (See Teacher Tip in Section 5.0 Procedure: Preparation”)
  - Laminated construction paper works well
- Objects to represent rock samples
  - Small Traffic cones work well
- 1 stopwatch per team (for use by the team timer)
- 1 set of job cards per team (see Section 5.0 Procedure: Preparation, Step A)
  - 30 3x5 index cards
- 1 set of 3 plastic sports cones per team
- LCD projector and computer with internet connection to show videos

Facility

- Large flat area to set up obstacle course (classroom, gym, or outside area)

Please Print:

From Student Guide

(A) Rover Driver Command & Information – 2 per 6-student team
(B) Official’s Record – 1 per student team
(C) Rover Team Evaluation – First Race – 1 per student
(D) Rover Team Evaluation – Second Race – 1 per student
(E) Iterative Process of Engineering – 1 per student
(F) Final Evaluation – 1 per student
Optional Materials

From Teacher Guide

(G) Course Set-up Example
(H) Iterative Process of Engineering Key
(I) “Rover Races” Assessment Rubrics
(J) Alignment of Instructional Objective(s) and Learning Outcome(s) with Knowledge and Cognitive Process Types

3.0 Vocabulary

Analyze: consider data and results to look for patterns and to compare possible solutions
Calibration: the act of checking or adjusting (by comparison with a standard) the accuracy of a measuring instrument
Constraints: limitations or restrictions
Design Criteria: the standards that are used to judge a proposal
Explanations: logical descriptions applying scientific information
Evaluate: check the scientific validity or soundness
Hypothesis: a suggested explanation that predicts a particular outcome based on a model or theory, to be shown true or false
Investigation: an exploration of a topic or question to gain information
Mission: an operation designed to carry out the goals of the space program
Models: a simulation that helps explain natural and human-made systems and shows possible flaws
Prediction: the use of knowledge to identify and explain observations or changes in advance (NSES, 1996)
Processor: onboard computer that performs calculations
Prototype: the entire system of models put together and tested to see if they coordinate (compare to test model)
Protocol: procedures or commands to be followed by a robotic mission
Robotics: the use of machines to perform manual tasks
Rover: a small remote-controlled vehicle that roams over terrain, taking photographs and gathering data about the surface
Solutions: the best choice given the criteria and constraints of the problem
Traverse: to move across
Tele-operate: to operate remotely (e.g., operating a Mars rover from Earth)
Test Model: a small component of the system that is tested (compare to prototype)
Uplink Command: directions sent through antennas on Earth (Deep Space Network) and received by antennas on a spacecraft or rover

4.0 Instructional Objectives, Learning Outcomes, Standards, & Rubrics

Instructional objectives, standards, and learning outcomes are aligned with the National Research Council’s A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas, which serves as a basis for upcoming “Next-generation Science Standards.” Current National Science Education Standards (NSES) and other relevant standards are listed for now, but will be updated when the new standards are available.

The following chart provides details on alignment among the core and component NRC questions, instructional objectives, learning outcomes, and educational standards.

- Your instructional objectives (IO) for this lesson align with the NRC Framework and education standards.
- You will know that you have achieved these instructional objectives if students demonstrate the related learning outcomes (LO).
- You will know the level to which your students have achieved the learning outcomes by using the suggested rubrics (see Teacher Guide at the end of this lesson).

Quick View of Standards Alignment:

The Teacher Guide at the end of this lesson provides full details of standards alignment, rubrics, and the way in which instructional objectives, learning outcomes, 5E activity procedures, and assessments were derived through, and align with, Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) taxonomy of knowledge and cognitive process types. For convenience, a quick view follows:
### HOW DO ENGINEERS SOLVE PROBLEMS?

**NRC Core Question: ETS1: Engineering Design**

**What is a design for? What are the criteria and constraints of a successful solution?**

**NRC ETS1.A: Defining & Delimiting an Engineering Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Objective</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate the measurable abilities</td>
<td>Students will address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO1:</td>
<td>LO1a: to identify limitations in an engineering design</td>
<td>NSES (E): SCIENCE AS INQUIRY: Abilities of Technological Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO1b: to generate solutions by setting new requirements to improve engineering design</td>
<td>Grades 5-8: E1b, E1c, E1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO1c: to test an engineering design</td>
<td>Understandings about Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO1d: to evaluate an engineering design</td>
<td>Grades 5-8: E2e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This activity also aligns with:

**NRC SCIENCE & ENGINEERING PRACTICES**

2) Developing and using models  
3) Planning & carrying out investigations  
4) Analyzing and interpreting data  
5) Using mathematics and computational thinking  
6) Constructing explanations and designing solutions

**NRC SCIENCE & ENGINEERING CROSSCUTTING CONCEPTS**

2) Cause and effect  
3) Scale, proportion, and quantity  
4) Systems and system models  
6) Structure and function

**21ST CENTURY SKILLS**

- Creativity and Innovation  
- Critical Thinking and Problem Solving  
- Communication  
- Collaboration  
- Information Literacy
On behalf of NASA’s Mars Exploration Program, this lesson was prepared by Arizona State University’s Mars Education Program, under contract to NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory, a division of the California Institute of Technology. These materials may be distributed freely for non-commercial purposes. Copyright 2012; 2010; 2000.

• Flexibility and Adaptability
• Initiative and Self-Direction
• Productivity and Accountability
• Leadership and Responsibility

5.0 Procedure

PREPARATION (~45 minutes)

Constructing the Job Cards and Obstacle Course

A. Prepare a set of Rover Races job cards for each rover team. Use 3” by 5” index cards and write the job titles on them:
   1 “Rover Driver” card
   3 “Rover Student” cards
   1 “Timer” card
   1 “Official” card

B. Use pieces of laminated construction paper (or similar) to create the obstacle course for the rovers. The course design can be anything. See (G) Course Setup Example.

C. Use small traffic cones (or any appropriate item) to represent rock samples

Apple Teacher Tips:
• Laminated construction paper works well for multiple uses and easy storage.
• Because some participants are blindfolded, do not use any items that could cause students to trip or fall (e.g., desks or chairs).
• Since Mars is the Red Planet, red construction paper in 12” X 12” sizes works really well, but any paper can work.
• If doing this activity outdoors, you might use tape to fasten the tiles down to prevent them from blowing away or disturbing the course design.

STEP 1: ENGAGE (~15 minutes)

Rover Driver’s License

A. Start the activity by having the students brainstorm about how a robotic vehicle on another planet (e.g., Mars) might be driven. Create a list of ideas.

B. Independently or together, read the following story about how the main driver of the Sojourner Rover earned a “Rover Driver’s license.”
C. To make a connection the Mars Science Laboratory mission, view an animation and read about how the rover, Curiosity, will make use of advances in autonomous navigation:

STEP 2: EXPLORE (~20 minutes)

Rover Course

A. Explain to students that rover drivers do not actually use a joystick to direct the rovers. It takes between 8-20 minutes for our data signal to reach Mars. So instead, the mission team creates a series of commands to direct the rover and sends them to the rover. This activity will demonstrate some of the complications humans (engineers) must overcome to allow for accurate communication to rovers on another planet.

B. Choose, ask for volunteers, or draw names of students to form rover teams. Six students are needed for each team:

- 1 Rover Driver
- 3 Rover Students
- 1 Timer
- 1 Official

Apple Teacher Tips:

- Use Rover Races job cards to recruit your first set of Rover Races participants. After making assignments, collect the cards and pass them out to the next Rover Races participants. These students can watch the first rendition of Rover Races knowing what their role will be in the next rendition.

- Pair students of different heights as the Rover Driver and the Rover Student. Due to their vastly different stride lengths, this selection will help to add to the complexity of the calibration that will emerge as a challenge during the first simulation.

- You can adjust the difficulty of the course by adding or minimizing the number of turns for the rover to make.
C. The Rover Driver will walk through the course first, counting the number of steps and listing the turns needed to guide the rover through the course (e.g.; 3 steps forward. Stop. 1 step left. Stop. etc.). The driver will use the (A) Rover Driver Command and Information Sheet to build the list of commands.

**Teacher Tip:** Have the Rover Drivers start to walk through the course and build the command list while the class is performing the initial brainstorming. This action will save time in starting the simulation with the entire class.

D. Once the Rover Drivers have recorded their uplink sequences on their (A) Rover Driver Command and Information Sheets, the rover races can begin. The rover teams are lined up at the starting line. Blindfold the three Rover Students to prevent the rovers from aiding the Rover Driver during the command execution. The 3 Rover Students represent the six wheels of the rover and are sequentially in a line (front to back). The blindfolded Rover Students have their hands placed on the student’s shoulders in front of them for stability.

**Teacher Tip:** This simulation is fun and the students can get quite engaged. To add to the simulation, have at least two teams going simultaneously (more is fine, just expand the course).

E. Once the Rover Drivers have recorded their uplink sequences on their (A) Rover Driver Command and Information Sheets, the Rover Students will proceed along the course by following the Rover Drivers’ verbal commands. The commands cannot be changed from the original commands that the Rover Driver wrote down. They must be followed exactly. During robotic missions, usually the commands are sent up all at once. Any changes have to be made in another uplink of commands later.

**Teacher Tip:** To prevent any road rage, give the Rover Drivers ground rules for driving their rover:
1. No yelling at the rover!
2. No touching the rover!

F. The Timers will start their stopwatch as soon as the teacher says “start” and will time until their rover team crosses the finish line. Their time will be recorded on the (B) Official’s Record.
G. The Official will use their (B) Official’s Record to record any time either foot of the first Rover Student touches a Tile on the course (foot faults). The Official will keep a tally of the number of fault that their rover team makes.

**Teacher Tip:** Remind the students that accuracy, not speed is most important in operating a planetary rover. No one will be on Mars to help the rover if it gets stuck.

H. The cones on the course are rock samples that can be collected if the Rover Driver has included it on their (A) Command and Information Sheet. The command would be “Rock Retrieval Right” or “Rock Retrieval Left” At that command, the third Rover Student bends down, and, still blindfolded, sweeps with his or her hand to feel the cone. The student picks the cone up and hands the cone to the second Rover Student to carry. The second Rover Student then has only one hand on the shoulder of the first Rover Student. The retrieved rock samples give the team extra points upon completing the course.

**STEP 3: EXPLAIN (~10 minutes)**

*Identify constraints.*

A. Allow time for all the teams to complete the course. Each Rover Team will get together to debrief how the driving went and complete the (C) Rover Team Evaluation Sheet. This information will include the challenges they faced or observed and their ideas about what might have caused those challenges. They will make a list of the challenges along with the suggested changes for the next drive.

**Teacher Tips:**

- After the first race, take time to debrief with the students. Have them describe some of the challenges and successes they found during their first race. What would they do differently?

- The students might observe that the size of the Rover Driver’s steps and those of the Rover Student’s steps are different sizes. The usual conclusion is that some type of control or calibration needs to be done to make the size of the steps uniform. This could be in the command change of “take baby steps” or take “giant steps”. Turns might be more accurate by saying, “turn 45 degrees” or “turn 90 degrees” right or left. Driving a rover with 3 axles is also different than walking the course as a single person.
**STEP 4: ELABORATE (~30 minutes)**

Revise race based on calibration.

A. When teams are finished, have students tally the counts on the *(B)* Official’s *Record Sheet*. The team that has successfully completed the course, with the least foot faults, most rock samples returned and best time is declared to have “mission success.”

B. Repeat the activity as time permits with the second group of students, allowing for the changes the students brainstormed to be included. This iteration will also allow for more students to participate directly. Students will complete a second version of their *(C)* Rover Team Evaluation Sheet.

C. At the conclusion of the activity, read the following to explain and tie up all of the Engineering concepts introduced and experienced in this activity:

> What you have just experienced is a lesson on engineering and how we communicate with a rover on another planet. Engineering allows us to solve human problems using science and technology. In this case, you found quite a few problems on your first round. Give me a couple of examples.

Examples students might note:

- Our steps were not the same, so we had to adjust.
- Moving three people is harder than moving one.

These are examples of calibration. Calibration means that you need to make adjustments to create a standard. For example, you adjusted the length of your step to a standard length for everyone in your group.

So, the engineering design cycle includes identifying a problem, specifying constraints (limitations) and criteria for the desired solution, developing a design plan, producing and testing models (physical and/or computer generated), selecting the best option among alternative design features, and redefining the design ideas based on the performance of a prototype or simulation.

Here are two videos of real engineers working with a physical rover model and one with a computerized rover model to solve real problems that the rovers encounter on Mars.

*Free Spirit - Plotting an Escape:*

*Curiosity Rover Rocks Rocker Bogie:*
STEP 5: EVALUATE (~60 minutes)

Evaluate proposed solutions.

A. Students will complete the (D) Iterative Process of Engineering Practices Sheet, filling in examples they experienced during Rover Races and possibly even drawing arrows when the cycle was interrupted and needed a revision. This cycle reflects the language in the NRC Framework and (E) Final Evaluation Sheet. The students have been provided kid-friendly terminology in their version of the (D) Iterative Process of Engineering Practices Sheet. An adult version and teacher sample of possible student results can be found in (G) Iterative Process of Engineering Practices. These (D)/(G) Iterative Process sheets can be utilized in the future as a formative assessment for all engineering lessons used in class.

B. It is important to define the difference between test models and prototypes for students. They can sound very similar; however, there is a distinct difference. A test model would be testing a small component of the system. For example, calibrating the length between steps would be a test model. A prototype includes the entire system of test models put together to see if they coordinate. If the students calibrated the step length and the number of commands, it is possible that, when those two test models are put together, the number of commands is too many for the Rover Students to keep track of.

C. Have the class discuss the results of the simulation. Were there advantages to taking the course slower and being more accurate (more careful moves, less foot faults) or perhaps taking advantage of the speed and getting as much done in a shorter period of time? Real planetary rovers have to coordinate utilizing available power and getting as much done as possible, but have to ensure that the risk to the rover is not too great.

6.0 Extensions

Rover Races Variations and Discussion Points:

1. To simulate remote sensing and a time delay, a video camera and monitor can be set up so that the Rover Driver is in another room and has to command the Rover Students via a runner going back and forth. Touch tablet or Smartphone technology could be used in coordination with CU-SeeMe applications instead of a video camera and monitor.

2. Have the students design their own rovers. Have them annotate what type of instrumentation they think would be necessary to learn about Mars. What would the scientific data their rover would collect reveal about Mars and why do they think this would be important?
7.0 Evaluation/Assessment

Use the (F) Final Evaluation Sheet to confirm student understanding of the iterative design process and the use of criteria based on constraints in a mission.

8.0 References


Student Guide

Lesson 10. Rover Races

(A) Student Worksheet. Rover Driver Command and Information Sheet

1. Walk through the simulated Mars’ surface obstacle course. Write down the commands the rover should follow. Count your steps and be sure to list where the rover needs to make a turn on the course.

2. When the rover is in the correct position to retrieve a rock, you may ask the last person in the rover to pick up the rock for bonus points. Use the command “Rock Sample Retrieval Left” or “Rock Sample Retrieval Right.”

3. The rover will only be able to follow your set of written commands. The commands to the rover cannot be any different from what you have written.

Rover Commands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>(L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Rock Sample Retrieval</td>
<td>(RSR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commands: (Example: 1. Forward 3 steps. Stop. 2. Turn left 1 step. Stop…….)

1. 11.
2. 12.
3. 13.
5. 15.
6. 16.
7. 17.
8. 18.
9. 19.
10. 20.
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(B) Student Worksheet. Official’s Record

1. Make a counting (tally) mark (example: lll…) every time the first person in your rover team steps on a tile (simulated Mars surface). These are called foot faults. Keep track through the entire course. And count up the marks to make a total after your rover team crosses the finish line.

NAME OF ROVER DRIVER:

NAME OF ROVER TEAM OFFICIAL:

NAME OF ROVER TEAM TIMER:

TOTAL FOOT FAULTS (steps on tiles by first person in rover):

TOTAL TIME FOR ROVER TEAM TO COMPLETE COURSE: ___________________

TOTAL ROCK SAMPLES COLLECTED: ____________________
(C) Student Worksheet. Rover Team Evaluation – First Race

As a class, complete the following after your Rover Team has completed the first race of Rover Races.

1. **Brainstorm some of the challenges you experienced during your first Rover Race and the potential causes of these challenges.**

2. **What are the suggested changes for the Rover Team’s next drive?**
(D) Student Worksheet. Rover Team Evaluation – Second Race

As a class, complete the following after the Rover Team has completed the second round of Rover Races.

1. Which changes worked well and why?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

2. Which changes did not work well and why?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

3. If you could do a 3rd race, what changes would you use to make your Rover move where you want it to go?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
The Iterative Process of Engineering

Start:
What is the problem?

What are the constraints?
(limitations)

Develop multiple solutions and test them.

Which design solution was the best?

Test the prototype or simulation.

Are there new problems?

Finish:
New product.
(F) Student Worksheet. Final Evaluation

Your teacher will read a paragraph and show a video clip or two. Answer the following questions using everything you have learned today.

**Identifying a problem:** Name at least 2 problems that needed to be solved for the team to develop successful communication to your rover.

1. 
2. 

**Specifying constraints (limitations) and criteria for the desired solution:** What were some of the requirements (constraints and criteria) you needed to consider for your solutions? For example, worked for all 3 student rovers, not just for 1 person.

**Develop a design plan, produce and test models (physical and/or computer generated):**
Did you create a physical or a computer generated design plan?

**Select the best option among alternative design features:**
How many different options did your group identify to solve this particular problem? 
Which did your group choose and why?

**Redefine the design ideas based on the performance of a prototype or simulation:**
After your group tried out the new design to solve your problem, did it solve the problem? What new changes would you like to try out to make this solution better?
(G) Teacher Resource. Course Set Up Example

Rover Races Key:
- Rover (3 People)
- Driver
- Timer
- Official
- Tile (Mars Surface)
- Rock Sample (Cone)

START LINE

FINISH LINE

START LINE

FINISH LINE
(H) Teacher Resource. Iterative Process of Engineering

Ex. Response
When we combined the standard step length with only using two commands at a time, they seemed to work better, but it was really slow.

Ex. Response
Rover doesn’t go the direction I was it to. They take longer steps. I gave too many directions at once. They were confused about what to do and what order.

Ex. Response
The rover needs to get through the course without touching the tiles. We need to get the steps the same length.

Ex. Response
To solve longer step problem:
- Create a string loop to wrap around legs to keep consistent baying (testing they trip!)
- Create a standard step length and practice (seems to work better)

Ex. Response
Use the standard step length

Ex. Response
I think we should try giving 3 commands at a time instead.
(II) Teacher Resource.  Rover Races Rubric (1 of 2)

You will know the level to which your students have achieved the Learning Outcomes, and thus the Instructional Objective(s), by using the suggested Rubrics below.

**Instructional Objective 1: To produce an engineering design that meets goals within constraints**

**Related Standards** (will be replaced when new NRC Framework-based science standards are released):

**National Science Education Standards (NSES)**

(E) Science and Technology: Abilities of Technological Design

**Grades 5-8:**

(E1b) Design a Solution or Product. Students should make and compare different proposals in light of the criteria they have selected. They must consider constraints—such as cost, time, trade-offs, and materials needed—and communicate ideas with drawings and simple models.

(E1c) Implement a Proposed Design. Students should organize materials and other resources, plan their work, make good use of group collaboration where appropriate, choose suitable tools and techniques, and work with appropriate measurement methods to ensure adequate accuracy.

(E1d) Evaluate completed technological designs or products. Students should use criteria relevant to the original purpose or need, consider a variety of factors that might affect acceptability and suitability for intended users or beneficiaries, and develop measures of quality with respect to such criteria and factors; they should also suggest improvements, and for their own products, try proposed modifications.

**National Science Education Standards (NSES)**

(E) Science and Technology: Understandings About Science & Technology

**Grades 5-8:**

(E2e) Technological designs have constraints. Some constraints are unavoidable, for example, properties of materials or effects of weather and friction; other constraints limit choices in the design, for example, environmental protection, human safety, and aesthetics.
Related Rubrics for the Assessment of Learning Outcomes Associated with the Above Standard(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO1a:</strong> to identify limitations in an engineering design (rover command sequence)</td>
<td>Analysis is highly accurate and complete.</td>
<td>Analysis is accurate and complete.</td>
<td>Analysis is somewhat accurate and complete.</td>
<td>Analysis is not accurate or complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO1b:</strong> to generate solutions by setting new requirements to improve engineering design (command sequence)</td>
<td>Requirements are highly detailed and precise.</td>
<td>Requirements are detailed and precise.</td>
<td>Requirements are somewhat detailed and precise.</td>
<td>Requirements are not detailed or precise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO1c:</strong> to test an engineering design</td>
<td>Tests result in significant improvement in design (goal achievement in completing the course).</td>
<td>Tests result in improvement in design (goal achievement in completing the course).</td>
<td>Tests result in moderate improvement in design (goal achievement in completing the course).</td>
<td>Tests do not result in improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO1d:</strong> to evaluate an engineering design (acceptable rover commands to complete a course)</td>
<td>Evaluation is highly clear and complete, with design changes well documented and thoughtful.</td>
<td>Evaluation is clear and complete, with design changes documented and thoughtful.</td>
<td>Evaluation is mostly clear and complete, with design changes documented.</td>
<td>Evaluation is not clear and complete, with design changes not well documented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This lesson adapts Anderson and Krathwohl’s (2001) taxonomy, which has two domains: Knowledge and Cognitive Process, each with types and subtypes (listed below). Verbs for objectives and outcomes in this lesson align with the suggested knowledge and cognitive process area and are mapped on the next page(s). Activity procedures and assessments are designed to support the target knowledge/cognitive process.

### Alignment of Instructional Objective(s) and Learning Outcomes with Knowledge & Cognitive Process Types (1 of 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Cognitive Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Factual</td>
<td>1. Remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa: Knowledge of Terminology</td>
<td>1.1 Recognizing (Identifying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab: Knowledge of Specific Details &amp; Elements</td>
<td>1.2 Recalling (Retrieving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Conceptual</td>
<td>2. Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba: Knowledge of classifications and categories</td>
<td>2.1 Interpreting (Clarifying, Paraphrasing, Representing, Translating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb: Knowledge of principles and generalizations</td>
<td>2.2 Exemplifying (Illustrating, Instantiating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bc: Knowledge of theories, models, and structures</td>
<td>2.3 Classifying (Categorizing, Subsuming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Procedural</td>
<td>2.4 Summarizing (Abstracting, Generalizing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca: Knowledge of subject-specific skills and algorithms</td>
<td>2.5 Inferring (Concluding, Extrapolating, Interpolating, Predicting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb: Knowledge of subject-specific techniques and methods</td>
<td>2.6 Comparing (Contrasting, Mapping, Matching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc: Knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures</td>
<td>2.7 Explaining (Constructing models)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Metacognitive</td>
<td>3. Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da: Strategic Knowledge</td>
<td>3.1 Executing (Carrying out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Db: Knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge</td>
<td>3.2 Implementing (Using)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dc: Self-knowledge</td>
<td>4. Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Differentiating (Discriminating, distinguishing, focusing, selecting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Organizing (Finding coherence, integrating, outlining, parsing, structuring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Attributing (Deconstructing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Checking (Coordinating, Detecting, Monitoring, Testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Critiquing (Judging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Generating (Hypothesizing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Planning (Designing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Producing (Constructing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(J) Alignment of Instructional Objective(s) and Learning Outcomes with Knowledge & Cognitive Process Types (2 of 3)

The design of this activity leverages Anderson & Krathwohl’s (2001) taxonomy as a framework. Pedagogically, it is important to ensure that objectives and outcomes are written to match the knowledge and cognitive process students are intended to acquire.

- **IO1**: to produce an engineering design that meets goals and constraints (6.3; Bc)
- **LO1a**: to identify limitations in an engineering design (1.1; Ab)
- **LO1b**: to generate solutions by setting new requirements to improve engineering design (6.1; Cc)
- **LO1c**: to test an engineering design (5.1; Cc)
- **LO1d**: to evaluate an engineering design (5.2; Bc)

Key:
- IO #: Instructional Objective
- LO #: Learning Outcome

A. Factual
B. Conceptual
C. Procedural
D. Metacognitive

1. Remember
2. Understand
3. Apply
4. Analyze
5. Evaluate
6. Create
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(J) Alignment of Instructional Objective(s) and Learning Outcomes with Knowledge & Cognitive Process Types (3 of 3)

The design of this activity leverages Anderson & Krathwohl’s (2001) taxonomy as a framework. Below are the knowledge and cognitive process types students are intended to acquire per the instructional objective(s) and learning outcomes written for this lesson. The specific, scaffolded 5E steps in this lesson (see 5.0 Procedures) and the formative assessments (worksheets in the Student Guide and rubrics in the Teacher Guide) are written to support those objective(s) and learning outcomes. Refer to (J, 1 of 3) for the full list of categories in the taxonomy from which the following were selected. The prior page (J, 2 of 3) provides a visual description of the placement of learning outcomes that enable the overall instructional objective(s) to be met.

At the end of the lesson, students will be able

**IO1:** to produce an engineering design

- **6.3:** to produce
- **Bc:** knowledge of theories, models, and structures

To meet that instructional objective, students will demonstrate the abilities:

**LO1a:** to identify limitations

- **1.1:** to identify
  - **Ab:** knowledge of specific details and elements

**LO1b:** to generate proposed solutions

- **6.1:** to generate
  - **Cc:** knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures

**LO1c:** to test an engineering design

- **5.1:** to test
  - **Cc:** knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures

**LO1d:** to evaluate an engineering design

- **5.2:** to judge with criteria
  - **Bc:** knowledge of theories, models, and structures