



Engineering Economics as a General Education Course to Expand Quantitative and Financial Literacy

Dr. Joseph Wilck IV, East Carolina University

Joseph Wilck received his PhD from Pennsylvania State University in Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, and a BS and MS from Virginia Tech in Industrial and Systems Engineering. Dr. Wilck is a registered Professional Engineer, former Vice President of Student Development for the Institute of Industrial Engineers (IIE), current newsletter editor for ASEE's Engineering Economy Division, and an active member of INFORMS, INCOSE, TRB, IEEE, and ASEM. Dr. Wilck's research has been sponsored by NSF, DOE, ORNL, NCDOT, and industrial partners. Dr. Wilck has held a faculty position at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He is currently an Assistant Professor of Engineering at East Carolina University.

Dr. Paul C. Lynch, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Paul C. Lynch received his Ph.D., M.S., and B.S. degrees in Industrial Engineering from the Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Lynch is a member of AFS, SME, IIE, and ASEE. Dr. Lynch's primary research interests are in metal casting, manufacturing, and engineering education. Dr. Lynch has been recognized by Alpha Pi Mu, IIE, and the Pennsylvania State University for his scholarship, teaching, and advising. He received the Outstanding Industrial Engineering Faculty Award in 2011 and 2013 for his work in undergraduate education at Penn State. Dr. Lynch worked as a regional production engineer for Universal Forest Products prior to pursuing his graduate degrees. He is currently a Lecturer and Academic Adviser in the Harold and Inge Marcus Department of Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering at the Pennsylvania State University.

Dr. Paul J. Kauffmann P.E., East Carolina University

Dr. Paul J. Kauffmann is a professor and former chair in the Department of Engineering at East Carolina University. His twenty year industry career included positions as Plant Manager and Engineering Director. Dr. Kauffmann received a B.S. in Electrical Engineering and MENG in Mechanical Engineering from Virginia Tech. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial Engineering from Penn State and is a registered Professional Engineer in Virginia and North Carolina.

Engineering Economics as a General Education Course to Expand Quantitative and Financial Literacy

Abstract

This paper presents the case for why engineering economics should be a commonly accepted general education course. Currently, most engineering courses are not considered appropriate for the general education of a college or university student. In the past an engineering economics course focused primarily on financial mathematics; however, the modern engineering economics course centers on financial decision making in addition to financial mathematics. These topics are applicable, if not mandatory, for students pursuing interests in engineering, law, product development, public service, entrepreneurship, marketing, business, finance, political science, sociology, government, and ethics. This issue is timely because schools at various levels (e.g., K-12, community colleges, and universities) are including the concepts of quantitative and financial literacy into their required curricula, with some being required by state law.

Motivation and Introduction

There is enormous pressure on curricula at public universities from legislatures to reduce the number of credits for graduation, while increasing graduation and retention rates and maintaining a substantial level of general education (or similarly named programs, such as: core curriculum, foundation curriculum, etc.) for the graduate. A reduction in credit hours is particularly difficult for engineering due to ABET accreditation requirements and employer expectations for engineering competency. Typically, the general education of a baccalaureate graduate includes a number of credits in composition, humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, mathematics, and physical education. Engineering courses are not considered appropriate due to the advanced mathematics and science requirements for the courses. However, the argument of this paper is that the current topical coverage of an engineering economics course satisfies the requirements for social and/or behavioral sciences recognition because it provides necessary skills in quantitative and financial literacy with respect to decision making. This argument follows the patterns and urgencies for increasing K-12 standards in mathematics in support of a thriving future science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce.

Other key arguments of note:

- Economic and social progress is an outcome of engineering change and application. It is estimated that 75-88% of all wealth creation is attributed to the application of technical and engineering change¹⁻³. This was originally shown by the Nobel Prize winning, macroeconomist, Dr. Robert Solow¹ and has been verified recently by others^{2,3}.
- Engineers apply and develop science and technology in designing products and systems. Via innovation, engineering design, research and development new technologies will become available to society over time. Understanding the economic characteristics of a technology and its costs is what distinguishes engineering economics from other branches of economics and finance.

- Engineering economics provides the foundation for making economic choices between competing technologies. Correct application of engineering economics principles to these choices will create new wealth for a society.
- Engineering economics can deal with the impact of new technology on environmental factors, public policy, and social sustainability.
- If students want to know the economic logic that has led to better ways of doing things, lower cost, and higher aggregate standards of living, it befits them to know the fundamental principles of engineering economics.

This paper also argues that including more engineering courses as general education courses could aid in the recruitment and retention of students who would not have considered engineering as incoming university freshmen. Thus, engineering economics as a general education course could aid in the recruitment and diversity of the engineering student body, and eventually the engineering workforce. This paper is organized as follows. It begins with an overview of the curriculum for social science and engineering education, followed by a literature review involving engineering related to these topics. Based on this foundation, it examines high school initiatives and future workforce initiatives. It concludes with student survey results from an undergraduate engineering economics course (with all students being engineering majors), and then summary remarks.

Curriculum Introduction

Social Science, as a General Education requirement, is described as⁴: “The goal of the social sciences is to help us understand the way that we live, especially the relation between the individual and the group, sometimes from an historical but often from a contemporary perspective. Vital to the continued health and success of our society is an understanding of the complex individual, political, and social dynamics that make up the modern world. Students should not only have knowledge of the principal concerns of the social sciences, but they should also understand the methods by which social scientists collect and evaluate knowledge.”

Engineering, as a discipline, seeks to find solutions that will benefit humanity and the society. The key curriculum attributes of the engineering economics course, as outlined in the following sections, are the application of the decision-making process to a variety of contemporary problems where technology and/or money are objectives or constraints. Consequently, based on these attributes, the course would be suitable for students interested in a wide range of fields including engineering, law, product development, marketing, business, finance, political science, sociology, government, and ethics.

Engineering Economics Curriculum

One goal of engineering economics is to teach students how to include the time value of money and the time value of technology within the decision making process. The course covers technology issues related to making decisions in today's society. A non-engineering student could be successful in this course and find value in its topics. The knowledge in the course is broad-based to a variety of non engineering disciplines, while it also meets the academic requirements of all engineering majors. For example, the financial mathematics topics are directly aligned with the Fundamentals of Engineering exam, which is necessary for engineers to become licensed within the state and nation. The point critical to broad application is that the

core topics of engineering economics can be presented in a way which does not require mathematics above the typical university level.

Note, depending on the engineering course objectives and topical coverage of the engineering economy course at a particular university, the current course could be modified to meet general education requirements and still maintain the current engineering course objectives. However, it may be the case that a different version of the course would be offered to satisfy the general education requirements of non-engineering students, and the current course be modified to satisfy the general education requirements and the engineering course objectives. This paper leaves that application to the specific program and individual reader.

The key is that the course provides an overview for analyzing decisions from the time value of money and time value of technology perspective for both individuals and organizations. Examples generally draw from a contemporary perspective rather than a historical perspective but touch on topics such as inflation in terms of consumer price indices, product price indices, and the federal minimum wage, which have historical significance.

The course covers a wide set of Social Sciences applications: Benefit/Cost ratios, Public Policy Projects, Taxes, Inflation, Bonds, Credit Reports, Investment Pyramid (Return versus Risk), and Ranking Methods. Each of these topics cover issues associated with making a decision. For example, within many public policy projects there are difficulties in quantifying the benefits and costs (which can be more subjective than quantitative), they often have long life horizons (e.g., parks, bridges, roads) which make it difficult to estimate usage, maintenance, etc., disagreements amongst stakeholders (e.g., "Not In My Backyard"), ethical issues (e.g., eminent domain), and financing issues (e.g., taxes versus bonds). After a discussion of the issues and assumptions, methods for collecting and evaluating the required data can be discussed in order to make an informed decision. For assignments and class discussions, students must make a definitive argument explaining the conclusion of the decision (both from the subjective and quantitative perspectives) using the decision making process outlined in class.

The examples covered by this course can include important contemporary issues; such as: a discussion as to why Kodak declared bankruptcy in January 2012, and why the United States Postal Service continues to raise the rates for first-class mail. The topics are not restricted to management, accounting, or economics. The overarching topic is decision-making within a broad-based context.

Engineering Entrepreneurship Curriculum

One of the traditional topics of engineering economics is the time value of money and this integrates well with one of the fundamental topics of entrepreneurship, the time value of technology. Understanding the fundamental concepts of engineering economics and then applying them to the technology innovation field is of great importance for graduates who pursue careers with start-up companies or technology development companies. Many engineering programs have created entrepreneurship curricula, and the implied knowledge of engineering economics is required in order to be successful within those curricula. Linking engineering economics with courses in engineering entrepreneurship is already occurring nationwide in

engineering programs. This is in addition to linking engineering economics (as a decision-making analysis course) to the engineering design process.

Flexibility of the Engineering Economics Curriculum

Course management systems and the corresponding course management styles of the professors have allowed the engineering economics course to be flexible in its delivery. It can be taught in large or small sections, synchronous or asynchronous, face to face or online (or hybrid), mixed methods, etc. The style differs greatly from one university to the next, but the content is overarching. There are a variety of textbook choices and innovations in the use of spreadsheets within the curriculum.

In summary, engineering economics contains critical topics that should be common not only to all undergraduate engineering majors within the USA, and is included on the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam, but also has broad application in many fields, can be delivered flexibly, and can be taught at various levels of math complexity. It is an area that has an opportunity to flourish as engineering programs and general education programs better understand the importance of decision making, entrepreneurship, and technology innovation within engineering economics.

Literature Review

Engineering education research has received continuous and growing support over the recent decades, and the engineering education literature indicates an improvement of engineering teaching and learning. A recent article⁵ summarizes the historical developments and presents goals for future research by specifically addressing these goals by developing “Strategies for Bridging Research and Practice.” Studies have been published that analyzed why students choose engineering and the primary conclusion was that students choose engineering based on their individual values⁶⁻⁸. Thus, there is a need to link student identities to engineering identities. A recent study has been conducted evaluating engineering students using identity theory⁹. There has also been a study focused on underrepresented students (i.e., females, minorities) with regards to their graduation rates, grade point averages, and changes in major across multiple universities¹⁰. There have also been studies on specific courses or content (e.g., engineering design)¹¹⁻¹².

Within the K-16 realm, there has been a push to increase the mathematical competency of students. Within the book, Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy¹³, the findings and suggestions are aligned with National Academy of Engineering (NAE) recommendations¹⁴; that an individual will need to have a basic understanding of decision making to make competent financial decisions in order to survive in the 21st century society. Additional newspaper reports, nationally funded studies, and books have been published on the importance of quantitative literacy¹⁵⁻¹⁹. The proposed concept of having engineering economics taught as a social science general education course continues on the prior work in engineering education, with a focus being on engineering economics.

Recent Engineering Economics Education Literature

There are many recent and ongoing studies of engineering economics education within the published literature. A futuristic look at engineering economics education was completed by

Eschenbach²⁰ in 2002. He makes a number of observations about the future of the course given past trends. He also provides insight into topical coverage of the traditional versus modern textbooks. In 1999, there were two papers with suggestions and comments for undergraduate engineering economics education by Hartman²¹ and Eschenbach²², and a follow-up discussion²³ in 2005. These papers discuss the (perhaps unwanted) move towards financial mathematics from decision making analysis, and also discuss spreadsheets and online educational tools (e.g., CD and online material in addition to the textbook material). It should be noted that recent engineering economics textbooks, published in 2011, have reemphasized decision making analysis²⁴⁻²⁵. Basically, engineering design includes the evaluation of multiple alternatives (including their economic impact, etc.); thus, engineers need to be skilled decision-makers and evaluators and the evaluation of economic impact of those decisions is taught in engineering economics. Many recent (since 2000) articles have been published that provide either structure or experiences in teaching engineering economics at both the undergraduate and graduate levels²⁶⁻³⁰, and the inclusion of risk and uncertainty in engineering economics³¹⁻³².

Linking to High School Initiatives and Future Workforce

Introduction

The topics and content of engineering economics are closely related to a number of regional and national initiatives. This section links engineering economics to high school initiatives throughout the country and to the growing technical demand of the country's workforce.

High School Initiatives and Inadequacy of the Common Core

Many states are looking closely at the specific learning outcomes of high school courses and an engineering economics course in college general education integrates well with these efforts. For example, Virginia has a policy for all public high school students to pass a Financial Literacy course prior to high school graduation³³. The topical coverage of this course links directly to a college course in engineering economics due to an emphasis on decision making with the time value of money concept for individual decisions (e.g., obtaining a loan, developing a personal budget, implications of a simple contract). The engineering economics course advances these topics at the individual level and also incorporates an understanding of decision making at the organizational level. The need for such a course at the high school level is to ensure success in the future workplace, and also preparing students for success in college. Engineering is being touted as a field that is not producing enough graduates for the jobs that are currently available in the USA³⁴.

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) has published a series of reform documents over the past 25 years³⁵⁻³⁸. New national standards for math instruction promote inquiry rather than memorizing and following procedures indicated by the teacher. More recently, NCTM published the Common Core Standards to provide consistent state standards. With these higher national, state, and local standards, increased pressure has been placed on students to increase their mathematical and science competencies. However, as suggested by a former Common Core Validation Committee member³⁹, the common core is not preparing students for STEM degrees, rather it is preparing the high school students for nonselective colleges and nonselective majors. *In other words, the Common Core does not prepare high school students to take calculus in the freshman year of college.*

The Engineer of 2020

The outputs of engineering programs over the next few years will make up a portion of the engineering workforce in 2020. The Engineer of 2020⁴⁰ includes members of the graduating class of 2020; *those students, assuming four years of high school and four years of college, entered their freshman year of high school in Fall 2012*. Many of these students will participate in AP courses and take AP exams while in high school. Furthermore, these engineers must be competitive in an increasingly dynamic and globally competitive technical environment and economy^{14, 41-42}. Basically, as engineering educators, one must prepare students to be modern and innovative without knowing what will be modern and innovative in the future.

The Demands of Industry

Technological development and industrial growth are increasing exponentially with expanding global applications, requiring a workforce that is adaptive to learning new technologies and developing innovations. A strong knowledge and understanding of STEM content and positive attitudes toward quantitative thinking are necessary to seek out opportunities in a constantly changing work environment⁴³⁻⁴⁴. In addition, the NAE publication, *Technically Speaking*¹⁴, emphasized the need for all people to obtain technological literacy to function in the modern world. Mathematical literacy has also been recognized for influencing students' education, professional, and life opportunities and their ability to engage in public policy debates that most often involve data-based arguments⁴⁵.

Conclusion

The topics and content of engineering economics are closely related to a number of regional and national initiatives. High school initiatives include financial literacy and personal finance; however, the common core is still not adequate for a high school graduate to go directly into an undergraduate engineering curriculum. The NAE has identified outcomes and traits of the future engineer and future workforce, these traits stress the need to understand engineering economic principles and their application to technology and society.

Survey Results of Engineering Students

Students are a critical stakeholder in this question of allowing engineering economics to be classified as a general education course in the social sciences (or behavioral sciences). We explored this by surveying 85 students (51 male, 30 female, and 4 unspecified) enrolled in an undergraduate engineering economics course, near the end of the semester at the Pennsylvania State University's University Park campus in the Fall 2013 semester [IRB approval on 2/8/2013; human subjects assurance number 42153]. The questions involving engineering economics as a general education course are provided in **Table 1**.

All of the students surveyed were either juniors or seniors in an engineering degree program, and all of the students had completed either microeconomics or macroeconomics at the undergraduate level (24 of the students had taken both microeconomics and macroeconomics).

Table 1: *Student Survey Questions for Engineering Economics Course.*

Relevant Survey Questions
1. Which of the following economics courses did you take or are you currently taking? - Microeconomics - Macroeconomics
2. If you took one or both of the courses listed in the prior question, which of the following courses do you feel was more valuable for you? (Circle Only One) - Economics Course(s) - Engineering Economics Course
3. Do you feel as though every student (non-engineering and engineering) should take a course like engineering economics? (Circle Only One) - Yes - No
4. Do you feel as though a course like engineering economics would be a good course to offer as a General Education course available to all students (as either social and/or behavioral science)? (Circle Only One) - Yes - No

The following bullets summarize the survey results:

- All 85 students indicated that the engineering economics course was “more valuable” than the microeconomics course and/or macroeconomics course.
- All 85 students indicated that the engineering economics course should be taken by both engineering and non-engineering students.
- The students also overwhelmingly indicated, 97.6% (83 of the 85), that engineering economics would be a useful general education course as a social science (or behavioral science) option.

It should be noted that the microeconomics course and macroeconomics course were included in this survey because they are allowable general education electives, and one (of the two) is required by Pennsylvania State University’s Industrial Engineering B.S. program. These courses are usually taken in the freshman or sophomore year. The second economics course can be taken to further achieve the general education requirements at the university of this particular engineering program.

Discussion and Conclusions

The concept of incorporating engineering economics as a general education course within an undergraduate education for all students (engineering and non-engineering) will contribute significantly to the understanding and interpretation of quantitative and financial literacy in general education. Preliminary research has shown that engineering students feel that engineering economics is more valuable than traditional economics courses and should be taken by both engineering and non-engineering students, and those same students overwhelmingly believe engineering economics should be included as a general education course. Further work would include surveying non-engineering students. It was also shown that this concept follows

the initiatives and thrusts for K-12 education in the USA to promote a thriving future STEM workforce.

The unique research component of this concept is to provide evidence of student learning and student success for engineering economics as a designated social science course to meet university general education requirements. This evidence will be used to produce published literature and reports that other engineering programs can use to request engineering economics as a general education course for their respective students and non-engineering students at their university.

Fundamentally, the concept will improve engineering education and add an additional pathway into engineering. The impact and significance of this project will provide evidence for universities across the USA to use engineering economics as a general education course to meet their social sciences education requirements. The engineering student will have the ability to take additional engineering content, engineering programs will have the flexibility to add more engineering content to their curricula (since a prior social science course can be eliminated), and most importantly this will open a pathway into engineering. The engineering economics course will become more diverse and multidisciplinary, with a possibility of encouraging non-engineering students to transfer into engineering, add an engineering minor, and/or pursue an engineering career. At minimum, the non-engineering student will get an overview of the engineering decision making process, financial mathematics, and engineering entrepreneurship while contributing to a more diverse engineering course. If engineering economics is to be implemented as a full scale general education course (and perhaps as a portion of course), then there is an opportunity for education materials (e.g., textbooks, online learning materials) that include more social and behavioral science initiatives and less financial mathematics.

Once successful, it is expected that additional engineering courses may be considered for general education courses; including topics and courses devoted to introductory engineering design, engineering entrepreneurship, and engineering ethics.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the excellent reviews and suggestions by the referees; particularly the Dr. Robert Solow reference and comments regarding motivation with respect to technology and innovation.

Bibliography

1. Robert M. Solow, "Technical change and the aggregate production function," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39(3), 312-320, August 1957.
2. John G. Fernald and Charles I. Jones, "The Future of U.S. Economic Growth," National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 19830, January 2014.
3. Cristiano Antonelli and Francesco Quatraro, "The effects of biased technological changes on total factor productivity: a rejoinder and new empirical evidence," *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1-19, January 2014.
4. University of Tennessee, Knoxville's 2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog, General Education Section, <http://www.utk.edu/advising/general-education-requirement>, Accessed: November 15, 2012.

5. Gary Lee Downey, Juan C. Lucena, Barbara M. Moskal, Rosamond Parkhurst, Thomas Bigley, Chris Hays, Brent K. Jesiek, Liam Kelly, Johnson Miller, Sharon Ruff, Jane L. Lehr, and Amy Nichols-Belo, "The Globally Competent Engineer: Working Effectively with People Who Define Problems Differently," *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95(2), 107-122, April 2006.
6. Holly M. Matusovich, Ruth A. Streveler, and Ronald L. Miller, "Why Do Students Choose Engineering? A Qualitative, Longitudinal Investigation of Students' Motivational Values," *Journal of Engineering Education*, 99(4), 289-303, October 2010.
7. Holly Matusovich, Ruth Streveler, Heidi Loshbaugh, Ron Miller, and Barbara Olds, "Will I Succeed in Engineering? Using Expectancy-Value Theory in a Longitudinal Investigation of Students' Beliefs," *Proceedings of 2008 American Society for Engineering Education Conference*.
8. Holly Matusovich, Ruth Streveler, Ron Miller, and Barbara Olds, "I'm Graduating This Year! So What IS an Engineer Anyway?," *Proceedings of the 2009 American Society for Engineering Education Conference*.
9. Olga Pierrakos, Thi Kay Beam, Jamie Constantz, Aditya Johri, and Robin Anderson, "On the Development of a Professional Identity: Engineering Persists Vs Engineering Switchers," *39th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, October 2009.
10. Maura J. Borrego, Miguel A. Padilla, Guili Zhang, Matthew W. Ohland, and Timothy J. Anderson, "Graduation Rates, Grade-Point Average, and Changes of Major of Female and Minority Students Entering Engineering," *35th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, October 2005.
11. Steve Krause, Jacquelyn Kelly, Amaneh Tasooji, James Corkins, Dale Baker, and Senay Purzer, "Effect of Pedagogy on Conceptual Change in an Introductory Materials Science Course," *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 26(4), 869-879, 2010.
12. Monica E. Cardella, William C. Oakes, Carla B. Zoltowski, Robin Adams, Senay Purzer, Jim Borgford-Parnell, Reid Bailey, and Denny Davis, "Special Session - Assessing Student Learning of Engineering Design," *41st ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, October 2011.
13. Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy, The National Council on Education and the Disciplines, Executive Editor: Lynn Arthur Steen, 2001.
14. Technically Speaking: Why All Americans Need to Know More About Technology, The National Academy of Engineering, Editors: Greg Pearson and A. Thomas Young, 2002.
15. Washington Post, *x=why?*, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/x-equals-why/2009/02/what_is_quantitative_literacy.html, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
16. Mount Saint Mary's College (Los Angeles, CA), Definition of Quantitative Literacy, <http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/quantitative-literacy-program/definition-of-quantitative-literacy.asp>, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
17. Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/QuantitativeLiteracy.pdf>, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
18. Calculation vs. Context Quantitative Literacy and Its Implications for Teacher Education, Mathematical Association of America, Editors: Bernard L. Madison and Lynn Arthur Steen, 2008.
19. North Carolina Community College System, Mathematics Curriculum Improvement Project (CIP) for 2012-2014, https://www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/state_board/SBCC%20Agendas%20&%20Attachments/2012/MAY%202012/PROG%206.pdf, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
20. Ted G. Eschenbach, "The Engineering Economy Course of 2020," *Proceedings of the 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference*.
21. Joseph C. Hartman, "Suggestions For Teaching Engineering Economy at the Undergraduate Level," *The Engineering Economist*, 44(1), 110-125, 1999.
22. Ted G. Eschenbach, "Suggestions for Teaching Engineering Economy at the Undergraduate Level," *The Engineering Economist*, 44(1), 126-128, 1999.
23. William R. Peterson, Rafael E. Landaeta, and Bryan Magary, "Is It Time For A New Paradigm?," *Proceedings of the 2005 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference*.
24. Donald G. Newnan, Ted G. Eschenbach, and Jerome P. Lavelle, Engineering Economic Analysis, 11th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2011.
25. Ted G. Eschenbach, Engineering Economy: Applying Theory to Practice, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press, 2011.
26. P.-W. On, and L. Occena, "Instructor's Perspectives of Transforming a Traditional Engineering Economics Course into a Fully Online Delivery," *Proceedings of the 2012 ASEE Annual Conference*.

27. Scott E. Grasman, "Teaching Engineering Economics via Distance Education," *Proceedings of the 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference*.
28. Joseph C. Hartman, and J. Smith, "Developing an Online Undergraduate Engineering Economy Course," *American Society for Engineering Education*, 2010.
29. Leslie Pagliari, Eugene Dixon, Paul Kauffmann, and M. Mehta, "A Distance Education Graduate Course in Engineering Economics: Results and Lessons Learned," *American Society for Engineering Education*, 2006.
30. Joseph Wilck and Paul Kauffmann, "A Comparative Review of Two Engineering Economics Sections: One Traditional and One Online," *Proceedings of the 2013 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference*.
31. Joseph C. Hartman, "Incorporating and Assessing Risk Analysis in Undergraduate Engineering Economy Courses," *American Society for Engineering Education*, 2012.
32. Ted G. Eschenbach and Jerome P. Lavelle, "How Risk and Uncertainty Are/Could/Should Be Presented in Engineering Economy," *IERC Proceedings*, Institute of Industrial Engineers, 2002.
33. Economics Education and Financial Literacy: Objectives and Correlations to Mathematics and History and Social Science Standards of Learning and Career and Technical Education Competencies, Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education, 2006.
34. USA's Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Projections, <http://www.bls.gov/emp/>, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
35. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989).
36. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Professional standards for teaching. Reston, VA: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1991).
37. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Principles and standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000).
38. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Common core standards. Reston, VA: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2010).
39. Sandra Stotsky, "Common Core Doesn't Add Up to STEM Success: The high-school math standards are too weak to give us more engineers or scientists," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 3, 2014.
40. National Academy of Engineering (NAE), Engineer of 2020, <http://www.nae.edu/programs/education/activities10374/engineerof2020.aspx>, Accessed: November 15, 2012.
41. Gisele Ragusa, "Preparing University Students for Global Workforces: Comparisons Between Engineering and Business School Students," *40th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference*, October 2010.
42. National Science Board, Task Committee on Undergraduate Science and Engineering Education, Homer A. Neal (Chairman), Undergraduate Science, Mathematics and Engineering Education: Role for the National Science Foundation and Recommendations for Action by Other Sectors to Strengthen Collegiate Education and Pursue Excellence in the Next Generation of U.S. Leadership in Science and Technology, Washington, D.C., National Science Foundation, 1986, NSB 86-100, 1986.
43. J. Bransford, A. Brown, and R. Cocking. How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington D. C.: The National Academy of Sciences, 2000.
44. P. Vail, Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
45. R.P. Moses and C.E. Cobb, Radical equations: Math literacy and civil rights. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001.