A Structured Approach to Teaching Fluid Power Systems Using Spreadsheets

Aaron K. Ball¹, Robert Anderson², Chip W. Ferguson³

Abstract –The use of spreadsheets such as Microsoft Excel[®] to supplement Engineering Technology has been implemented in many areas with demonstrated success including fluid power systems. Spreadsheet based commercial products such as Fluid Tools[®] are available for quickly performing calculations required for component sizing and circuit analysis. However, a different approach was taken at Western Carolina University to supplement instruction and enhance student learning in a Fluid Power course. Students were required to develop independent Excel[®] worksheets in a logical progression corresponding to topics covered in class. These worksheets were then used by students to check homework problems and perform laboratory calculations. Further, a fluid power calculator was developed by each student through combining Excel[®] worksheets as a final semester long project. This paper will describe how this approach was implemented into a fluid power course at Western Carolina University. Background objectives will be presented along with descriptions and examples of student developed worksheets. Instructional methods, student performance, and educational merit will be discussed.

Keywords: Fluid power, circuit analysis, Microsoft Excel®

BACKGROUND AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVE

Engineering Technology programs typically focus on applied scientific knowledge and engineering principles while engineering programs emphasize the theoretical aspects.^{1,2} Modern computer tools have become an integral component of curriculum and provide efficient methods of blending theory into practice. However, this common use has also contributed to differences between the practicing engineer and technologist becoming more clouded.³ Commercial software packages can enable students to rapidly perform calculations with relative ease and efficiency. Similarly, circuits can be created and simulated with only a modest knowledge of background theory. However, without adequate knowledge of fundamental laws and theory, this approach may give a false impression as to the ease of engineering design, component selection, and circuit analysis. This virtual approach does not always reflect characterization of actual circuit performance. Knowledge of basic laws and fundamental theory is essential for understanding fluid power systems.

Wingo suggested that effective course design strategies implement instructional methodologies that affect multiple dimensions of learning.⁴ Students who prefer abstract conceptualization with concrete answers would likely benefit from solving theoretical problems in a more traditional manner as described by Kolb.⁵ However, more positive learning outcomes may be achieved through active experimentation using a hands-on approach. Computer-based programs can be used to promote a better understanding of systems and component functions. Microsoft Excel[®] provides an excellent method of reinforcing learning through structured equations and provides a means for immediate feedback as suggested by Marsh⁶. Graphing and charting functions can also reinforce the basic understanding of systems through visual feedback. A more structured approach for teaching fluid power at Western Carolina University was implemented employing some of these approaches. However, students were required to develop accompanying worksheets using Microsoft Excel[®] corresponding to theoretical topics presented in class. The primary objectives of this approach were to reinforce theory through interactive formula based learning

¹ Associate Professor, 332 Belk, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723, <u>ballaaron@wcu.edu</u>

² Assistant Professor, 117 Belk, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723, randerson@wcu.edu

³ Assistant Professor, 223 Belk, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723, <u>cferguson@wcu.edu</u>

activities and to develop working tools for evaluating fluid power systems. As opposed to using commercial software products, students were required to write equations and structure worksheets through a logical interactive approach. Individual worksheets were assembled as a working group of system tools, in the form of a final semester project.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Traditionally engineering technology courses in fluid power have followed a classical approach by covering basic fundamentals and theoretical laws. The Fluid Power course at Western Carolina University follows a similar approach with emphasis on traditional theory and logical sequence as shown below:

Logical Sequence and	Course Content
Fluid Properties	Actuators
Pascal's Law	Pressure losses and circuit analysis
Continuity Equation	Fluid, Brake, and Torque Horsepower
Bernoulli's Equation	Pumps and Efficiencies
Reynolds' Numbers	Perfect Gas Laws
Darcy's and Hagen-Poiseuille equations	Pneumatic systems

Table 1: Course Sequence and Content

While commercial software packages are available for providing relatively quick calculations to analyze variables and determine logical parameters for system components, students may benefit more from developing structured equations based on presented theory. Formulas entered in spreadsheet format require students to have a better grasp of variables and relationships. Further, calculations performed in both U.S. Customary and SI units can be accommodated with relative ease by using spreadsheets.

STRUCTURE AND APPROACH

After theoretical relationships were covered in class and reviewed in the Esposito⁷ textbook, students began developing corresponding Excel[®] worksheets for use in homework and laboratory assignments. Students were required to develop and submit completed worksheets each week as evidence of demonstrated competency of the topic covered. Further, students were encouraged to use developed worksheets to validate manual calculations from both homework and laboratory assignments. This logical approach was taken throughout the duration of the semester, and progressed from basic to more advanced topics. Examples of student generated worksheets showing relevant formulas as entered in Excel[®] are described in the following section.

Fluid Properties and Pascal's Law

Corresponding to the first two topics presented in class lectures, students began by developing worksheets for fluid properties and sizing hydraulic cylinders based on Pascal's law as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Both theoretical formulas and graphical representation were encouraged, and calculations in the U.S. customary and S.I. units were required.

	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
39							
40							
41							
42			Specific	Gravity Ca	lculations		
43		Enter "E	" for Englis	sh or "M" f	or Metric		E
44	Enter D	ensity of M	laterial	- 55	lb/Cu.Ft		
45	Sp	ecific Grav	rity	0.88141			
46							
47	Enter	Specific G	iravity	0.88			
48	Ma	terial Den	sity	54.912	lb/Cu.Ft		
49							

Figure 1: Fluid Properties Module



Figure 2: Cylinder Specifications Module

Efficiency and Power

Theoretical relationships of power, horsepower, and efficiencies were presented to students as shown in Figure 3 and Table 1. Sample problems were worked in class coupled with assigned homework problems requiring hand calculations which were checked prior to the development of the actual Excel[®] worksheet.



Figure 3: Theoretical Relationship between Horsepower and Efficiency

2007 ASEE Southeast Section Conference

Nomenclature		
BHP - Brake Horsepower	N - RPM	\mathbf{K} – Conversion constant
FHP - Fluid Horsepower	P – Pressure	$T_0 - Observed torque$
T – Torque	Q – Flow rate	Tt – Theoretical torque
E _m – Mechanical efficiency	e _v – Volumetric Efficiency	e <mark>o – Overall efficiency</mark>
V_d – Volumetric displacement		

	Table 2:	Nomenclature	Related to	Horsepower	and Efficiency
--	----------	--------------	------------	------------	----------------

After demonstrating a theoretical understanding of horsepower and efficiency, students were required to develop the next logical worksheets. Using Excel, students developed related worksheets for calculating flow rate, pressure, horsepower and efficiency. By observing changes in one variable, students were able to obtain immediate feedback of how such changes related to theoretical relationships, and thereby were able to gain a better understanding over the conventional manual calculation approach. Examples of student generated worksheets for horsepower and efficiency are show in Figures 4 and 5.

	licrosoft Ex	cel - Fluid S	ystems Cal	culator							1
1	Ele Edit	Yew Ins	ert Forma	t Iools D	ata <u>₩</u> indo	w <u>H</u> elp					
10	🐸 🖬 🛛	ها 🕒 🕯	17 = (1	• X •	100%	- 🕻 Aria	i i	v 10	• B I	₩ 💵	i
1	20 20 0	a 🗠 🖄	000	8 Ha 🔒 👔	the Reply wit	h ⊆hanges	Epd Review.				
	G7	*	& =F(\$G	\$4="e".(B7"	07)/1714.(8	37*D7)/44.7	6)	2			
	A	8	C	D	E	F	G	н	1	J	j
1											l
2				Fluid	I Horsep	ower					l
з			FI	ow And P	ressure	are Kno	wn				l
4			Enter	Fluid Flo	w and Sy	/stem Pr	essure				ĺ
5		Fluid	Flow	System	Pressure		Horse	power	Watts		l
6		Lg	m	M	pa		h	ρ			l
7		 95.0 	3000	+ 5.0	300		- 10.6	122	7916.667		l
8											l
9											l
10											T

Figure 4: Partial Fluid Horsepower Worksheet

💌 M	licrosoft Ex	cel - Fluid S	ystems Calc	ulator					
: 🛃	<u>Eile E</u> dit	⊻iew <u>I</u> ns	ert F <u>o</u> rmat	<u>T</u> ools <u>D</u>	ata <u>W</u> indo	w <u>H</u> elp			
8 🗅	😂 🖬 🕻	3 🔒 🖂	10 - 01	- Σ - 🔓	<u>)</u> 100% ·	- 📮 Aria	ıl	- 10	• B I
8 🛄	11 12 2	i 🗠 🖄 i	🔁 🏷 I 💆	1 🖦 😥	🕶 Reply wit	h ⊆hanges	End Review		
	H17	-	∱ =IF(OR(ISBLANK(A	417),(A17)=	0)," ",(A17)/(D17))		
	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
1									
2			E	fficien	cy Calc	ulation	s		
3			Pump I	Displacem	ent and Ad	ctual Flow	Known		
4	Enter Pu	ump Displa	acement	Enter S	ystem Actı	ial Flow		Pump E	fficiency
5	4.3	32	LPM		4	LPM		0.9	259 -
6									
7			Pump Dis	placemen	t and Pum	p Efficien	cy Known		
8	Enter Pu	ump Displa	acement	Enter	Pump Effie	ciency		Actua	Flow
9	1	3	LPM		0.8			10.4	LPM
10						F.62.1			
11	Enter Ma		fficiency	Mechanic	cal and Pu	mp Efficie	ncy Know	n Eurotaura F	
12	Enterme		niciency	Enter	Pump Ein	ciency		System	
14		0.05			0.5			0.0	
15	Calc	ulate Moto	r Hp Reau	irement- S	System Effi	ciency an	d Motor Ef	ficiency Kr	nown
16	Enter F	luid or To	que Hp	Enter	System Eff	iciency		Required F	lorsepowe
17	• 3	7	Hp	•	0.801			46.1923	Hp
18									
19				Calculat	e Power F	lequireme	nt in KW		
20		Enter Re	quired Ho	sepower			Electric	al Power	
21		• 1	0	Нр			7.4600	KW	
22							-7 460.0	Watts	
23									
1.74								1	I

Figure 5: Partial Pump Efficiency and Power Module

2007 ASEE Southeast Section Conference

The logical approach and sequence as described previously was incorporated throughout the semester leading up to circuit analysis. Engineering technology students typically have more difficulty with Bernoulli's equation and the theory behind circuit analysis. In an attempt to facilitate a better understanding of the topic, a practical approach was taken by evaluating system requirements for a single actuator hydraulic press.

Students were required to size conductors, determine pressure drops, and conduct circuit analysis through both manual and spreadsheet calculations. While conductor sizing and pressure drop analysis can be carried out through manual calculations, the time involved to perform such calculations can be tedious and further lead to confusion on the part of the student. However, spreadsheets provide immediate feedback allowing students to more quickly grasp the effect of changing critical variables in the equation. A simplified schematic of the hydraulic press circuit presented to students for analysis is shown below.



Figure 6: Example Problem for Conductor Sizing and Pressure Drops

The previous system analysis problem as presented during lecture focused on specifying acceptable fluid conductors and determining pressure losses through selected conductors at critical locations within the circuit. Students were required to perform hand calculations prior to constructing an associated Excel[®] worksheet. For illustration purposes, an example of logical steps and theoretical calculations are shown for head loss due to friction relative to the hydraulic press circuit. A student developed Excel[®] worksheet based on the following equations and as presented by Esposito⁷ is shown in Figure 8.

Students were presented design parameters and known specifications along with recommended logical steps in determining acceptable conductor sizes and solving for pressure losses due to friction. Fluid velocity on the inlet side of the pump (20 gallons per minute flow rate) was specified as a maximum of 4 feet per second. Similarly, the outlet velocity was limited to 15 feet per second. Steps in solving for the appropriate conductor and associated pressure loss due to friction included the following:

- 1. Determine the theoretical Inside Diameter (I.D.) for the required conductor
- 2. Specify the acceptable standard size conductor available
- 3. Calculate the fluid velocity and kinetic energy for conductor specified
- 4. Calculate Reynolds Number (NR) and associated friction factor (f)
- 5. Determine head loss due to friction based on friction factor, length; including conductor length and equivalent length of valves and fittings, conductor diameter, and kinetic energy
- 6. Determine pressure loss within the section of interest.

1. THEORETICAL I.D. FOR CONDUCTORS: $D = \sqrt{408(Q)/V}$ INLET OUTLET $D = \sqrt{(.408(20))}/4 = 1.428in$ $D = \sqrt{(.408(20))}/15 = .737in.$ SYSTEM PRESSURE: P = F/A = 20,000 lbs./12.57 in². = 1591 psi 2. PIPING INLET: USE 1 1/2 SCHEDULE 40; I.D. 1.610 in. 3. V= .408(20)/ 1.61² = 3.148 ft./sec. $v^2/2g = .154$ ft. 4. NR = [(7740)(3.148)(1.61)]/ 98 = 400 (laminar) f = 64/400 = .16**5.** $H_1 = f(\frac{L}{D})(\frac{v^2}{2\sigma})$ L = Lpipe + LeLpipe = .5+2+2+1 = 7.5 ft. $Le = \left(\frac{\sum K}{f}\right)(D/12) \qquad (\text{Note: D is divided by 12 to convert to feet})$ $Le = (\frac{3.6}{16})(1.61/12) = 3.02 \text{ ft}$ Le = 7.5 + 3.02 = 10.52 ft $H_{1} = .16(\frac{10.5}{134})(.154) = 1.93$ ft. (Note: D is divided by 12 to convert to feet) 6. $\Delta P = yh$ in this case, $h = H_L$ Therefore: 56.16 lbs/ft³ (1.93 ft) = 108.38 lbs/ft² $\Delta P = 108.38 \text{ lbs/ft}^2 \times 1 \text{ ft}^2/144 \text{ in}^2 = .7527 \text{ psi}$ (negative on inlet side of pump)

Figure 7: Example Hand Calculations Showing Pressure Drop on Inlet Side of Pump

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
2									
3		ENTER :	(E)nglish	0R	(M)etric	UNITS	e r		
4			CALCULA	TING IN :	ENGLIST	SYSTEM	•	CONVER	TING TO:
5	SPECIFI	ICATIONS	6			ENGLISH	METRIC	METRIC	UNITS
6		Specific Gr	avity (Sg)			0.9		0.9	Sg
7		Kinematic	Viscosity (c	St or <i>m 29s</i>	eo)	98		0.000098	m^2/sec
8		Pipe Inside	Diameter	(in. or <i>mm</i> /	7	1.61		40.894	mm
9		Flowrate	(GPM or Z	PM)		20		75.7062	LPM
10		Elevation	(Feet or AM	eters)		10/	1	0	meters
11		Pressure a	t Point One	(PSI or <i>BA</i>	RĮ	0	17	0	BAR
12		Conductor	Length (Fee	et or <i>Allefers</i>	57	7.\$0	//	2.286	meters
13			Yalves &	Fittings:	K Value	Quantity			
14			Gib. Yalv	. Vide Op	10		0		
15				1/2 Open	12.5		0		
16			Gate Val	v Vide Op	0.19		0		
17				3/4 Open	0.9		0		
18			Other:	DCV	5		0		
19			Other:				0		
20			Return B	end	2.2		0		
21			Standard	Tee	1.		0		
22			Standard	Elbow	0.0	1	3.6		
23			45 Degre	e Elbow	0.42		0		
24			90 Degre	e Elbow	0.75		0		
25			Ball Chee	ck Valve	4	L <u> </u>	0		
26				K FACTO	DR EQ U IV	ALENT SI	3.6		
27						/			
28		SU.	MMAR	Y OUT	PUtb	ATA I	ABLE		
29		Circuit:							
30					ENGLISH	UNITS	METRIC	UNITS	
31		Veight D	ensita		1 56.16	lbs/ft^3	8817.3	N/m°3	
32		Velocite			3.149027	ft./sec.	0.960661	m/sec	
33		Reynolds	Number		400,2941		400.8701		
34		Friction	Factor		0/5988		0.15965		
35		Total Ler	ngth (Lpip	PLUS Le	0,52097	feet	3.208116	meters	
36		Head Los			929314	feet	0.589126	meters	
37		Pressure	due to fri	iction	0752432	PSI	0.051945	BAR	
38		Pressure	Available	Point 2 =	-0.7524	PSI	-0.0519	BAR	
39									
40									
44									
		£ =IE((G3	B="M") ((((G11*1000	1001/E31)-	G10-E36)	*E31)/100		11*144)/F

FLUID SYSTEMS CALCULATOR: PRESSURE LOSS MODULE

Figure 8: Pressure Loss Worksheet Showing Formula Entry and Associated Reference Cells.

EDUCATIONAL MERIT

The approach taken in using spreadsheets to enhance teaching and learning provides a solid method for supplementing instruction in fluid power. Enhanced learning is evidenced through reinforcing computer skills and strengthening applications in verifying engineering design parameters related to fluid power systems. However, these skills are not always explicitly taught in engineering curriculums where the focus has been on content and analytical skills of specific engineering disciplines. Industry and the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) nonetheless expect engineering graduates to have well developed computer skills.⁸ The modular approach implemented at Western Carolina University provides a logical and systematic method for building on theory and developing essential computer skills. Through immediate feedback, students can gain a better understanding of variables in equations and the impact of changing design parameters in a system.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Student feedback and performance has been positive, and integrating worksheets into a semester project provided a vehicle for transferring theoretical knowledge to practical, systematic application. Compared to previous semesters when students performed only manual calculations, an improvement was observed in students' ability to more rapidly understand theoretical concepts. Overall, students also performed better on homework assignments, laboratory assignments, and tests compared to previous semesters when the use of spreadsheets was not integrated into the course. This practical approach has also resulted in improved skills that can be directly applied in other classes and also has provided more continuity within the Engineering Technology curriculum at Western Carolina University. Future assessment will include a planned experimental design for comparing two groups to determine if the observed differences are statically significant. Ongoing program assessment will continue to provide feedback on the effectiveness of supplementing instruction using methods presented in this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kumar, Ratan and Mitty Plummer, "Using Contemporary Tools to Teach Dynamics in Engineering Technology," *International Journal of Engineering Education*, Volume 13, Number 6, pp.407-411 Retrieved November 12, 2005 from http://fie.engrng.pitt.edu/fie2000/papers/1447.pdf.
- [2] Grinberg, I., *Engineering Infrastructure Diagramming and Modeling*, National Academy Press, Washington DC, 1986.
- [3] Ball, A., Ferguson, C., and W. McDaniel, "Using Steam Engines to Teach Parametric Modeling and Rapid prototyping," *Proceedings of the American Society of Engineering Education-Southeastern Section Annual Conference and Exposition*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama, April 2006.
- [4] Wingo, O. G., "Analysis of Learning Style Preferences in Adult Learners." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1992. (Dissertation Abstracts International, Publication no. AAI 9304072).
- [5] Kolb, D. A., *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- [6] Marsh, B., "Integrating Spreadsheet Templates and Data Analysis into Fluid Power Instruction," *Journal of Industrial Technology*, Vol. 16 No. 4. August 2000-October 2000. National Association of Industrial Technology.
- [7] Esposito, A., *Fluid Power with Applications, 6th Edition.* Englewood Cliffs, NC: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [8] ABET Board of Directors, "Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs," Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology Inc., 2003.

Dr. Aaron K. Ball

Dr. Aaron K. Ball is an Associate Professor and serves as the Graduate Program Director in Engineering and Technology at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina. He holds a B.S. and an M.S. from Appalachian State University, and earned his doctorate from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. His areas of interests include fluid power, advanced machining, prototyping systems, and applied research.

Dr. Robert Anderson

Dr. Robert Anderson is currently an Assistant Professor of Engineering Technology at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina. He is also the Coordinator of Engineering Technology. Dr. Anderson earned his B.S., Masters, from Clemson University, and his Ed .D. North Carolina State University. Prior to his arrival at Western Carolina University, Dr. Anderson served as Dean of Applied Technology at Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College and taught in the CAD Systems program. He also worked for Asheville Industries a division of Newport News Shipyard for 12 years as Engineering Design Supervisor

Mr. Chip W. Ferguson

Chip W. Ferguson is an Assistant Professor of Engineering Technology at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina. Professor Ferguson earned his B.S and M.S. at the University of Southern Mississippi, and currently a doctoral candidate at Western Carolina University. Prior to his arrival at Western Carolina University, Professor Ferguson served for five years as a full-time faculty member at Hinds Community College, Science and Technology, and two years as a graduate teaching assistant at the University of Southern Mississippi. He has five years of industrial experience working with mechanical and fluid power systems.