

Simulated Laboratory-Based Learning In A Thermal Fluid Laboratory Course

Dr. Mohammad Abu Rafe Biswas, The University of Texas at Tyler

Dr. Rafe Biswas is an Associate Professor at the University of Texas at Tyler in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. His expertise and interests include process dynamics and control, fuel cell systems and thermal fluid engineering education. He teaches courses in system dynamics and control, process control, energy conversion, and thermal fluids laboratory at the Houston Engineering Center. He also has been advisor and mentor to several senior design project groups.

Mr. Benjamin Lee Stilwell, The University of Texas at Tyler Mr. Edgar Reyes

Edgar Reyes is an undergraduate Mechanical Engineering student at the University of Texas at Tyler. His interests include thermal fluid sciences and alternative energy systems.

Simulated Laboratory-Based Learning In A Thermal Fluid Laboratory Course

Mohammad Abu Rafe Biswas, Benjamin Stilwell, Edgar Reyes

Department of Mechanical Engineering University of Texas at Tyler

Abstract

The overwhelming and well documented success that stems directly from the integration of hands-on activities into the course core structure educates and develops competent and independent engineers. Most educators look for experiential learning elements to engage students through interactive concept practice, thus leading their students to reach new levels of comprehension. The SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (Covid-19) created a unique challenge for instructors to adjust the remainder of their courses in order to adapt to a new educational medium. Traditionally hands-on courses, such as laboratory-based courses, also required adaptation. One such course employed a set of simulated thermal experiments as a replacement for the hands-on experiments for the remainder of the semester. The different experimental approach involved a remote demonstration of live simulation allowed for measurement of pressure and temperature differences across the heat exchanger as well as for adjustment of flow rates. This simulated based laboratory experiment was developed and conducted by a senior design group using software such as LabVIEWTM and MATLAB® & Simulink® for implementation and testing in future offering of the thermal laboratory course.

Introduction

The hands-on experience has been found through literature to be one of the most effective modes to teach and grow capable and self-sufficient engineering professionals¹. Therefore, most engineering educators seek experiential learning techniques and implementations pioneering and captivating to help students understand and exercise the engineering concepts they learned². Although laboratory-based learning allows students to deduce and apply concepts, this more commonly used approach is typically limited by the physical laboratory resources, unlike many current approaches^{2,3,4}. This search for a more innovative learning technique in a thermal fluid laboratory course to give students a broader perspective leads to identifying and developing a simulation-based remote laboratory learning experience utilizing relevant computational software tools that provide students an equivalent or complementary learning opportunity as a face-to-face laboratory activity. The concept of a remote laboratory suggests the utilization of the Internet and a system of hardware and software control technologies that the user can remotely access and conduct real-time experiments⁵.

The goal was to develop and implement a laboratory-scale thermal fluid system, which will be accessible both physically and online with a user interface. This interface would allow for simulated or physical data acquisition and remote access to thermal fluid laboratory equipment such as a heat exchanger. This allows engineering students to carry out laboratory activities on simulated or physical equipment located on campus through online access. The system will be available to use for

interactive laboratory activities. The access to such a system in conjunction with the existing computational tools available will give great exposure and valuable practical experience to the mechanical engineering students to further depth and breadth in their engineering education, similar to the project at another institution⁵.

Data acquisition systems play a vital role in the industrial sector and real-time decision making. As companies evolve towards an information focused methodology in production and operations to maintain a competitive edge while facilitating users' access to the information at any time, regardless of the location, data acquisition systems have evolved from mere processing systems to arriving at full automation capacities. Education in automation requires both theoretical and practical knowledge. In most cases, students gain theoretical knowledge in the classroom, but laboratory experience is needed to obtain practical skills. Compared to traditional hands-on experiments, the implementation of new technologies can help students comprehend and practice the concepts since it can develop conventional teaching tools and methods, similar to the laboratory environment at different institutions^{6, 7}. Therefore, the university took the initiative to introduce future students to a user interface that will test the theories and concepts in the thermal fluid laboratory. This will help to effectively address the two relevant course outcomes:

- 1. Apply heat transfer concepts for analysis of basic heat exchangers configurations, and
- 2. Design, perform, and report results of a mechanical engineering experiment,

to subsequently correspond to student outcomes on the ability to develop and <u>conduct appropriate</u> <u>experimentation</u>, <u>analyze and interpret data</u>, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions.

With the support from the university and the Department of Mechanical Engineering, the team initiated a pilot study. This study included the development of initial design, analysis, and simulation of the system, which resulted in very favorable outcomes. The following phase of the study involved multiple senior design groups in completing the successful design and construction of subsystem prototypes over the past two years. Last Spring semester, a new group of students led by the thermal fluid laboratory faculty worked on the user interface to monitor and collect data from these prototypes to later result in an integrated heat exchanger system for future laboratory activities. The group also began to generate pilot instructional material and exercises based on selected prototype equipment. The resulting work was evaluated over the Summer and Fall terms and then planned to be implemented by this Spring term. However, the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic thrust this ongoing project into overdrive to move up completion and evaluation by last Spring semester. This group worked to design and develop a modular graphical user interface that would allow the user to remotely operate a simulated heat exchanger and acquire data where the physical system is inaccessible.

Current Hardware

The current experimental equipment consists of the Armfield DLMX system shown in Figure 1. The system consists of a small battery-operated base unit and seven different cartridges "covering fluid mechanics, thermodynamics and heat transfer" ⁸. The battery-operated base unit can be plugged into a standard wall outlet. The base consists of a clear acrylic fluid reservoir. Under the base, is a variable speed-controlled pump, a flow meter, the battery, a level sensor, and all of the base circuitry. The base unit also houses a small unit display. The DLM cartridge design creates a simple push-to-fit interface with self-sealing hose connections. The cartridges contain their own microcontroller that relays information to the base unit. Each cartridge is designed as a simple experimental representation of the applicable content. This system boasts a simplistic setup procedure⁸.



Figure 1. The Armfield DLMX system⁸.



Figure 2. Connection Diagram for data acquisition⁹.

Available Software

The software used was a significant factor in the development of the modular interface. The software systems introduce an ideal platform for both developing and implementing embedded applications due to its versatility. The final design contained a control algorithm using LabVIEWTM and MATLAB®/Simulink® as the platforms, which are included in the academic license for students, for design, simulation, and implementation.

Process of Simulation Based Heat Exchanger

Although the current experimental equipment for DLMX heat exchanger experiments and activity materials offers a unique small design that enables the reading of multiple units, including DLM-5 double pipe heat exchanger, DLM-1 crossflow heat exchanger, DLM-4 shell and tube heat exchanger,

the integrated digital display interface lacks pressure measurements, thermal control and simple, easyto-use data visualization. Using National InstrumentsTM Laboratory Virtual Instrument Engineering Workbench (LabVIEWTM), the team interfaced with a simulated (or in the future physical) heat exchanger and stored the data onto the machine. The data collected had the option to be then fed into a secondary interface developed using MATLAB® and Simulink®, allowing the user to further analyze the results and visualize system performance. Figures 3 and 4 show the set of interfaces developed and demonstrated for the thermal fluid laboratory course to conduct simulated heat exchanger laboratory activities.

Pressure Drop of the Tube 210.614 h Log Mean Temperature Difference 12.353 Cdmg Heat Transfer Rate of the Tube 0.006 m Overall Heat Transfer Rate 0.006 m Pressure Drop of the Shell 64.087 m Overall Heat Transfer Coefficient 12.857 mm ⁻² x Heat Transfer Rate of The Shell 0.006 m 0.006 m	ihell & Tube Temper	ature: In Range Pressur	e: In Range	San be Zourants and Teacher
Image: That They is in the they is That They is in the their is That They is in the they is That The they is That They is in the they is That The they is That They is in the they is That The they is That	Pressure Drop of the Tube 210.614 _{Pa} Pressure Drop of the Shell	12.353 _{Cdeg} Overall Heat Transfer Coefficie	0.006 w Heat Transfer Rate of The Shell	provide and the second s
Connection Coefficient of the twee Table Natio Field Value(b) of Hale Field Max Volatily of Hale Field Max Volatily of Hale Field Repeats Humber of Hale Connection Coefficient of Hale Field Value(b) of Hale Field Hale Notice of Hale Field Repeats Humber of Hale LATA With Y and Y Field Value(b) of Hale Field Hale Notice of Hale Field Repeats Humber of Hale LATA With Y and Y Field Value(b) of Hale Field Hale Notice of Hale Field Repeats Humber of Hale LATA With Y and Y Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Connection Coefficient of Hale Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Value Y and Y Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Coulds Expension of Hale Field Double Staff, my a Field Value Y and Y Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Coulds Expension of Hale Field Double Staff, my a Field Value Y and Y Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Coulds Expension of Hale Field Double Staff, my a Field Value Y and Y Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Value Y and Y Area of Ha Hale Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a Field Staff, my a </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>Synth Take Result (Control <thtake (control<="" result="" th=""> Take Result (Control</thtake></th> <th></th>			Synth Take Result (Control Take Result (Control <thtake (control<="" result="" th=""> Take Result (Control</thtake>	
SARE TELEVISION of the interview Mile total of the interview State in the interview Area of the total Outlide transmitter of the Huld State in the interview Italities in the interview Italities interview Italities interview Italities interview State in the interview Italities interview Italities interview Italities interview Italities interview State interview Italities interview Italities interview Italities interview Italities interview	Convection Coefficient of the inner Tube Walls			
R3.3 R3.4*2 K 4138.445 m-2 Control Temperature of Mail Tool Control Temperature of Mail Tool R3.3 R3.4*2 K 4138.45 m-2 Control Temperature of Table Tool Difference R3.5 m Total Temperature of Table Tool Difference Difference R3.5 m Total Temperature of Table Tool Difference R3.5 m Total Temperature of Total Total Temperature Difference R3.5				
Loss = ULBERT av2 PLE Carp				

Figure 3. The current version of Shell and Tube heat exchanger interface for laboratory activity in LabVIEW™

In Figure 3, the top left corner of the interface consists of a drop-down option for working fluid. The top middle portion of the interface contains LEDs that determine the operating condition of parameters. In this case, the operating parameters are temperature and Pressure. The Green LED illuminates and displays the user that the parameter is operating in range. The Yellow LED lights up and informs the user that the parameter is operating in low range along with an error message. Finally, the Red LED illuminates and urges the user to initiate shutdown as the parameter has exceeded the safe operating range. The user can also access calculated parameters near the bottom of the interface. Two graphs were embedded in the interface to display the graphical representation of the temperature and pressure measurements through simulation. The left graph provides a graphical representation of the tube for inside temperature (white line), outside temperature (red line), the temperature inside the shell (green line), and temperature located outside the shell (blue line). The graph on the right side in Figure 3 shows the pressure measurement inside the tube (red line), the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line), and the pressure measurement inside the shell (green line). The user will experience the data fluctuation over time. The

graph always saves the last run by default. The portion between the two graphs features two rectangular blocks, one for the tube and one for the shell. Each block includes an analog indicator along with numeric values of the temperature inside, the temperature outside, the pressure inside, and the pressure outside.

Figure 4 shows the front panel of the same heat exchanger with virtually the same features as in Figure 3 except it is developed in Simulink[®]. Figure 5 illustrates the expected steps and procedures that will occur when successfully running the experimental. This flowchart is used to demonstrate the functionality of the interfaces shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. When a user runs the program, a simulated data acquisition system or a physical data acquisition device like NI-DAQ device (further in the future) will read the signal from a sensor, which will then convert the data from analog to digital. This digital data will be stored then displayed both numerically and graphically over time.

Seamless operation is critical to mitigating any issues when utilizing the interface. Thus, it was tested and evaluated to verify the compatibility between the user interface and the heat exchanger system before implementation. The initial testing helped to identify the heat transfer within a Shell & Tube heat exchanger concerning its specific flow patterns for hot and cold fluids. It addressed the impact of various design parameters on the performance of the heat exchanger.

31.832 iPa	Log Mean Temperature Difference 18.9 Deg. C	Heat Transfer Rate of The Pipe 6.9204 IN	Overall Heat Transfer Rate
Pressure Drop of The Annulus 40.648 Pre	Overall Heat Transfer Coefficient 456.15 wmm²2 K	Heat Transfer Rate of The Annulus 6.9204 ww	6.9204 xw
		Annulus	
	Temp in 26.1	Deg.C. 137,9 sPag	
	Temp C 35	ut Pressure Out Deg. C 97.252 sPag	
	3 4 5 6 7 2 0 7 6 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		
		Pipe	
	Temp in 45	Pressure In Deg. C 137:9 kPag	
	Temp O	ut Pressure Out	
Temperature Readings	(Deg. C)	8 2 0 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Pressure Readings (kPag)
Convection Coefficient of The Inner Pipe 1 433.83 wim*2x	Natis Fluid Velocity of The Pipe F 0.0599 mit	Mass Velocity of The Annulus Fluid 61.005 agmr2.	Reynolds Number of The Annulus 2778.9
Convection Coefficient of The Annulus	Fluid Velocity of The Annuli	as Fluid Mass Velocity of The Pipe Fluid	Reynolds Number of The Pipe
411.74 Wim*2 K	0.0612 mila	59.288 sgrw12 s	3251.1
	Hydraulic Diameter	Temperature of the Pipe Fluid Out (Parallel Flow) 45 Deg. C	Temperature of the Pipe Fluid Out (Counter Flow) 45 Deg. c
Convection Coefficient of The Pipe 407.37 Wim*2 x	16.07 mm	ong. o	
Convection Coefficient of The Pipe	16.97 mm Equivalent Diameter 39.533 mm	Temperature of the Annulus Fluid Out (Parallel Flow)	Temperature of the Annutus Fluid Out (Counter Flow) 26.1 Deg. C

Figure 4. The current version of Shell and Tube heat exchanger interface for laboratory activity in Simulink®



Figure 5. Flowchart for a single parameter during simulation



The students conducted at least one separate laboratory exercise through the simulated interface including a Shell & Tube Heat Exchanger. The simulation-based experiment was conducted to verify the operation and data accessibility of a simulated heat exchanger system. Due to the pandemic, the experimentation took place through a video conference meeting software. Like the current physical DLMX units, this heat exchanger experiment was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of the simulated data input measurements using a theoretical model with the tube flow settings of a flow rate of 2 L/min and shell flow setting at a flow rate of 5 L/min. The second portion of the experiment comprised a change in the tube flow meter flow rate while keeping the shell flow meter setting the same at 5 L/min. The change in the flow rate meter was from 2 L/min to that of 5 L/min to match the shell flow meter. The dimensions and inlet temperatures (shell at 20°C and tube at 50°C) are obtained based on existing physical heat exchangers and corresponding laboratory activities to use in the numerical analysis for concepts covered in the thermal fluid laboratory course. Such analysis includes the calculation of estimated outlet temperatures, heat duties, log mean temperature difference (LMTD), overall heat transfer coefficient, and heat exchanger effectiveness.

Comparison with physical laboratory activity

The physical heat exchanger allowed for real-time measurements of outlet temperatures using thermocouples to then allow to the use of LMTD method for heat transfer analysis. Unlike the physical heat exchanger, the outlet temperatures had to be estimated using Number of Transfer Units (NTU) method. The physical heat exchanger allowed for hands-on troubleshooting when the unit was not working, thus this simulated interface can provide valuable experience to students on developing problem-solving in unexpected, unwanted conditions.

On the other hand, the inlet flow temperatures of the simulated heat exchanger can be set at constant temperature values while the inlet temperatures of the DLMX unit heat exchanger could not maintain constant temperature values due to the mixing of the fluid in a tank on tube and shell sides, respectively. This meant the fluid temperature in the tank, which is same as the inlet temperature, changed over time as the outlet temperature flow returned instead of exiting to a sink. Moreover, the manual knob did not allow for accurate flow setting unlike the simulated heat exchanger. The physical heat exchanger did not have pressure measurements to allow for pressure drop analysis, but the simulated heat exchanger collects and presents such data. The simulated heat exchanger also allows to test and analyze the performance for various geometric designs and operating conditions including the current units in a short period of time by making changes to certain parameters, which is very limited for the available set of physical heat exchangers.

Assessment of Simulated Laboratory

The course learning outcomes are designed to meet the accreditation criteria currently required from ABET, specifically in thermal fluid science experimentation and data analysis. This system will specifically assess for simulated laboratory environment based on three course learning outcomes:

- 1. Apply fluid mechanics concepts for the analysis of fundamental fluid mechanics experiments.
- 2. Apply heat transfer concepts for the analysis of basic heat exchangers configurations.
- 3. Design, perform, and report results of a mechanical engineering experiment.

These course learning outcomes correspond to ABET Student Outcome 6, which is to develop and conduct appropriate experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions¹⁰. Proof of effective learning is integral to the successful implementation of any new educational tool. The student assessment involves direct and indirect assessment. Direct assessment will be taken from student performance in the laboratory activities. To measure student performance, a rubric has been developed to evaluate the course learning outcomes for the course at five achievement levels that ranges from a score of 5 that corresponds to students exhibited complete understanding of the technical content of the outcome or the specified skills and a confidence in applying the techniques or skills to a score of 1 that corresponds to students exhibited no understanding of the technical content of the specified skills and were unable to apply them. Indirect assessment will be obtained from a student survey as shown in Figure 5. The responses of the survey questions are considering student feedback based on a Likert scale model where a value of 1 is associated with strongly disagree and a value of 5 is associated with strongly agree. The instructor will gather student input in the thermal fluid laboratory course at the end of the semester. Students will learn about its essential functions before the experiment and then complete the simulated

experiment. There will be a follow up through email by a faculty outside of the course to get student feedback using a survey. These assessments will help document the value-added learning of this simulated laboratory experimental setup and provide meaningful feedback for future laboratory-based learning improvements.

Categories		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
Attitude Towards Interface	Visualization of the data through the User Interface was simple.	1	2	3	4	(5)
	The User Interface was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
	The Lab's Remote Access was effective.	1	2	3	4	5
Attitude Towards Design	The emergency shutdown protocol is a great feature for the User Interface.	1	2	3	4	(5)
	The familiarity of MATLAB as the platform directly helped in the learning process.	1	2	3	4	(5)
	The Industrial Platform makes things more efficient.	1	2	3	4	5
Conceptual Understanding	The User Interface design makes things clear enough for anyone to understand.	1	2	3	4	(5)
	Performing a task on the interface is straightforward.	1	2	3	4	5
	The characters & messages on the screen were extremely simple to understand.	1	2	3	4	(5)

Figure 5. Questions Used in Surveys Administered by group and instructor.

Summary and Conclusions

The data and information in this report can be used to develop strategies to provide an interface that will allow the student user to visualize data display and data collection in a simulation-based laboratory environment. It will also enable the user to monitor and analyze the collected data readily. Additionally, it will allow data storage in the user(s) choice of the file during continuous operation. Utilization of LabVIEWTM and MATLAB & Simulink[®] provides an easy acquisition of data and monitoring at various stages of the heat exchanger. The simulated instrumentation allows the user to adjust the virtual interface at any point in time. Thus, this set of interfaces can serve as a secure, usable, and adaptable framework for using laboratory mechanical engineering experiments based on the implementation and evaluation of the Shell & Tube HX interface.

References

2. L. D. FEISEL and A. J. ROSA, "The Role of the Laboratory in Undergraduate Engineering Education," Journal of

^{1.} N. Barakat, "Balanced integration of theory and applications in teaching robotics," International Journal of Mechanical Engineering Education, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 195-206, 2011.

- 3. Penn State, "Developing cornerstone engineering education," Pennsylvania State University, [Online]. Available: [2] http://news.psu.edu/story/467609/2017/05/09/research/developing-cornerstone-engineering-education.
- 4. WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, "Engineering," 22 July 2016. [Online]. Available: https://www.wpi.edu/academics/engineering.
- 5. R. D. Manteufel, A. Rogers and A. Karimi, "Using Hands-on Thermal-Fluid Projects to Motivate Students," in ASEE Gulf-Southwest Annual Conference, Lafayette, 2002.
- D. Spayde, M. Green and K. R. Kinard, "Student Response to the Introduction of Programmable Logic Controllers Through the Use of a Virtual Engineering Laboratory Environment," in ASEE Southeastern Section Conference, Raleigh, 2019.
- 7. M. K. Green, D. L. Spayde and P. J. Mago, "Use of Instructional Videos to Enhance the Learning Objectives of the Thermal Fluids Laboratory," in 2018 ASEE Southeastern Section Conference, Daytona Beach, 2018.
- "Armfield Desktop Learning Modules DLMX Series DKSH Product," DKSH Group, [Online]. Available: https://www.dksh.com/global-en/products/ins/armfield-desktoplearningmodules-dlmx-series. [Accessed 20 10 2020].
- 9. "What Are Multifunction I/O Devices?," National Instruments, [Online]. Available: https://www.ni.com/en-us/shop/data-acquisition-and-control/what-are-multifunction-io-devices.html. [Accessed 20 10 2020].
- "Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs, 2019 2020," Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, [Online]. Available: https://www.abet.org/accreditation/accreditation-criteria/criteria-for-accreditingengineering-programs-2019-2020. [Accessed 04 27 2020].

Dr. Mohammad Abu Rafe Biswas

Dr. Biswas is an Associate Professor at the University of Texas at Tyler in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the Houston Engineering Center. His expertise and interests include process dynamics and control, fuel cell systems and thermal fluid engineering education. He also has been advisor and mentor to several senior design project groups.

Benjamin Stilwell

Benjamin is a graduate Mechanical Engineering student at the University of Texas at Tyler. His various interests including thermal fluid sciences and fuel cell systems.

Edgar Reyes

Edgar is an undergraduate Mechanical Engineering student at the University of Texas at Tyler. His interests include thermal fluid sciences and alternative energy systems.

9