

Modification and Assessment of a Residential Summer Program for High School Women (Evaluation)

Aimee Cloutier, Texas Tech University

Aimee Cloutier is a Ph.D. student studying Mechanical Engineering at Texas Tech University. She earned her B.S. in Mechanical Engineering from Texas Tech in 2012. Her research interests include biomechanics, rehabilitation engineering, prosthetic limb design, and STEM education.

Mr. Guo Zheng Yew, Texas Tech University

Guo Zheng Yew is currently pursuing his doctorate in civil engineering at Texas Tech University with a focus on finite element analysis and glass mechanics. Prior to his graduate work in the United States, he obtained his Bachelor's degree from Malaysia and has participated in research projects involving offshore structures in Malaysia. As a graduate part-time instructor at Texas Tech University, he teaches an introductory course in engineering to freshmen undergraduate students. He has taught at Texas Tech University since the fall of 2013.

Mr. Siddhartha Gupta, Texas Tech University

Siddhartha Gupta is a third-year PhD student in the department of Chemical Engineering at Texas Tech. He received a bachelor's degree in chemical engineering from the Indian Institute of Technology and subsequently worked as shift engineer for two years with a Fortune 500 chemical company before joining the PhD program at Texas Tech. His current research interests include microfluidics, machine learning, holography and biomedical instrumentation.

Mrs. Chamila Kalpani Dissanayake

Dr. Paula Ann Monaco, Texas Tech University

Dr. Paula Monaco, E.I.T., successfully defended her dissertation research Spring 2016 and began a career as a wastewater consultant with Alan Plummer Associates. Paula has led multiple outreach summer programs at Texas Tech University and provides support to student organizations within the college of engineering.

Dr. Susan A. Mengel, Texas Tech University

Susan Mengel, Texas Tech University

Dr. Susan Mengel is an associate professor in the Computer Science Department of the Edward E. Whitacre Jr. College of Engineering at Texas Tech University. Her research interests include computer science education, computer security, and information retrieval.

Dr. Audra N. Morse P.E., Texas Tech University

Dr. Audra Morse, P.E., is a Professor in the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Construction Engineering at Texas Tech University. Her professional experience is focused on water and wastewater treatment, specifically water reclamation systems, membrane filtration and the fate of personal products in treatment systems. However, she has a passion to tackle diversity and inclusion issues for students and faculty in institutions of higher education.

Modification and Assessment of a Residential Summer Program for High School Women

Abstract

The importance of reducing the gender gap in engineering programs by recruiting and retaining female students is well recognized. Although women hold roughly half of all jobs in the United States, only 24% of STEM jobs are occupied by women. The problem is even more pronounced for engineering, where women held about 12% of jobs as of 2013³. Consequently, interactive, hands-on outreach programs are a common tool used by universities to encourage interest in engineering from K-12 students. Engineering—Get Into Real Learning (E-GIRL) is a week-long, residential summer program offered by Texas Tech University for female high school students. The primary goal of the program is to help participants make informed decisions about engineering majors and careers. To this aim, the purposes of the program are: 1) to offer a platform for female high school students to learn about the various disciplines of engineering offered at Texas Tech University and other universities; 2) to provide a realistic university experience, including coursework, social, and professional development opportunities; and 3) to provide hands-on exposure to a real-world engineering problem. E-GIRL ran for the second time in the summer of 2016 based on the favorable support it received in 2015. Primary components of this year's program were a multidisciplinary group project focused on the theme of CO₂ capture and storage as well as a series of two-hour classes taught by university faculty and graduate students in the following six engineering disciplines: chemical engineering, civil engineering, environmental engineering, industrial engineering, mechanical engineering, and computer science. This paper presents the multidisciplinary structure of the program and how it connects to the project that was assigned to program participants. The curriculum structure, the in-class activities, and the method of delivery for each discipline are explained in depth. The assessment of the program's second year, including comparisons to the results from the first year and modifications to the program based on feedback from previous program participants are discussed. The assessment instruments include engineering skills assessment questionnaires requiring students to self-evaluate their competence in eighteen skillsets before the program and after the program. These skillsets are qualities often identified to be important for engineers and encompass traits associated with problem solving, project management, teamwork, and communication skills. Key results show improved self-assessment for most of the engineering skills after the program. Additionally, the skills which did not show improved self-assessment ratings after the program were consistent throughout both years. Qualitative results show a more matured and complete understanding – after the program – of engineering and the individual engineering disciplines. Through oral presentations, participants demonstrated in-depth engagement with the environmental conservation theme of the project. The environmental conservation theme is consistent with the participants' aspirations for considering an engineering career and championing sustainability, which was highlighted by program participants in 2015 as a desired additional focus of the program. Overall, the program provided an opportunity for participants to experience the multidisciplinary nature of engineering, aided participants' understanding of the roles of the individual engineering disciplines, and furnished a realistic preview of student life in a university.

Introduction

The recruitment and retention of women in engineering is an issue that is considered important by both academics and practitioners¹² as engineering problems are often

multidisciplinary challenges that require input from various engineering faculties and benefit from a diverse set of viewpoints¹⁷. It is therefore concerning to note that the participation of women in STEM education^{13,5} and subsequently in engineering led employment is subpar to that of men^{1,16}. The under representation of women in STEM education indicates a pressing need to identify and address the various barriers and to design mechanisms specifically focused on attracting and retaining women in engineering degrees and careers.

Although a recent study shows that the number of women in science and engineering is growing, men continue to outnumber women, especially at the upper levels of these professions⁷. Thom and Thompson¹⁵ conducted a study on recruiting models and concluded that the traditional recruiting model ignores the internal needs of young women who are conscious of self-image and self-worth and who worry that women in technical careers are perceived as less feminine. As early as elementary school, boys typically possess more interest in studying science than girls. By middle school, girls' attitudes toward science tend to decline, and this decline may persist through high school⁹. Young women may also fear failure and assume that males have superior technical knowledge. Further, a perceived lack of support, communication, and camaraderie may deter young women from pursuing technical careers. Thom and Thompson suggest that to interest young women in technical careers may require an atmosphere of mutual assistance and effective communication¹⁵.

Interestingly, in elementary, middle, and high school, girls and boys take math and science courses in roughly equal numbers, and about as many girls as boys leave high school prepared to pursue science and engineering majors in college. By graduation, however, men outnumber women in nearly every science and engineering field, and in engineering, the difference is dramatic, with women earning only 20 percent of bachelor's degrees⁷. Hill, Corbett and Rose conclude that while biological gender differences may play a role, these differences clearly are not the whole story⁷. They suggest that girls' achievements and interest in math and science are shaped by the environment around them. For example, a simple training course can dramatically improve spatial skills, which are generally considered important in engineering and for which men consistently outperform women. So, girls who are offered spatial training or similar preparatory courses may experience increased confidence and skill and will later consider a future in a STEM field. The researchers also recommend that institutions communicate that girls and boys are equally capable of achieving in math and science and should encourage high school girls to take calculus, physics, chemistry, computer science, and engineering classes when available⁷.

The purpose of Engineering—Get Into Real Learning (E-GIRL) is to expose female high school students to the vast array of engineering disciplines needed to solve challenges in the oil and gas industry. Students are often unable to articulate the differences among the different engineering disciplines and are even less certain about how the engineering disciplines work together in industry to accomplish projects. As such, the participants of the E-GIRL program were provided a classroom experience designed to teach them about engineering disciplines in the context of an industry (oil and gas) challenge, specifically related to CO₂ capture. Then the participants selected a discipline/role to experience during the group project on CO₂ capture. Through this experience, it was expected that participants would gain a better understanding of

the potential activities an engineer may conduct in her career while providing the participants with an opportunity to have a college experience.

Existing outreach efforts to expose students to engineering at Texas Tech University (TTU) include three robotics competitions, including Get Excited About Robotics (GEAR) for elementary and middle school students, FIRST Tech Challenge and FIRST Robotics Competition for students in grades six through twelve, and West Texas Best Robotics for students in kindergarten through twelfth grade. These robotics competitions are quite popular with several thousand students competing. In addition, TTU student organizations also sponsor one-day outreach events. For example, the Texas Tech Society of Women Engineers offers Catch the Engineering Bug in the fall and Night at the Science Spectrum in the spring. These events are targeted at females in middle to high schools and include short activities introducing students to several engineering disciplines. The last offering of Catch the Engineering Bug had nearly 200 girls signed up to learn about engineering.

More broadly, in the state of Texas, one notable effort to introduce students to engineering is the Texas Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (T-STEM) Academy for students in grades six through twelve. A total of 121 academies exist, 22 of which were chartered in the 2016-2017 school year. At the middle school level, students take three years of STEM electives while at the high school level, students take four years of STEM electives. The curriculum must be project- and problem-based with extracurricular STEM activities, field experiences, clubs, and competitions. It is optional for students to enroll in the T-STEM academy; for example, 70 of New Deal's 200 high school students opted to join the T-STEM Academy.

Another option for schools is to implement the Project Lead the Way curriculum (www.pltw.org). Project Lead the Way has prepared curriculum from kindergarten through twelfth grade in three main subject areas, such as computer science, engineering, and biomedical science. In addition, teacher training is available. Schools may choose at the high school level to implement one or more of the three subject areas. Several schools in the independent school districts of West Texas offer Project Lead the Way curriculum including Amarillo (engineering), Pampa (engineering), New Deal (engineering), and Lubbock (engineering, biomedical science).

Since engineering is still optional in Texas schools and females as an underrepresented group in engineering are not specifically recruited for engineering programs in Texas schools, more programs are still needed to be sure that as many K-12 students as possible get a chance to learn about engineering. Indeed, E-GIRL stands out as a balanced effort to introduce girls to engineering with a concerted effort to build a learning community during the week of activities.

In this paper, we first begin by discussing the structure of the program and providing a description of the activities for each of the six engineering disciplines. Next, participant demographics are provided along with pertinent information related to students' interests in pursuing engineering careers before the program. The salient results from our study are then discussed and interpreted in the context of women's participation in engineering, and finally, concluding remarks are provided.

Program Structure

E-GIRL is structured as a week-long, residential outreach program. The program was envisaged as a platform to disseminate information about engineering disciplines by tackling a multidisciplinary challenge modeled after a real-world problem. The multidisciplinary engineering challenge combined discipline specific projects from computer science, mechanical, civil, environmental, chemical and industrial engineering that focused on a unifying underlying theme. The theme for 2016 was CO₂ capture, in contrast to the 2015 theme based on hydraulic fracturing¹¹. Throughout the week, teams of program participants worked together to complete a major project (in this case, the design of a CO₂ capture facility) where each group member played the role of a specific kind of engineer, and groups presented their designs at the end of the week. These presentations represented the requirements of an engineering career where proper and clear communication of technical knowledge is expected. Students also attended classes and participated in campus tours, recreational activities, and professional development activities. Table 1 outlines the day-to-day structure of the program. Any space designated as “Free” indicates that students had the option of choosing how to spend their time (preparing for the next day’s classes, working on the group project, etc.).

Table 1. E-GIRL Program Structure

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:30 AM	Intro to Engineering and Project Overview	Industrial Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Q&A with Instructors	Presentation Practice
9:00 AM					
9:30 AM					
10:00 AM	TTU	Mechanical Engineering	Computer Science	Football Stadium Tour	Presentations
10:30 AM	Presentation				
11:00 AM	Safety Training				
11:30 AM	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Project Work	Awards
12:00 PM					
12:30 PM					
1:00 PM					
1:30 PM					
2:00 PM	Civil Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Free	Presentation Skills Workshop	
2:30 PM					
3:00 PM					
3:30 PM					
4:00 PM	Team Building	Campus Tour	Career Workshop	Pool	
4:30 PM					
5:00 PM	Dinner	Dinner			
5:30 PM					
6:00 PM	Free		Dinner		
6:30 PM					
7:00 PM	Student Recreation Center	Free	Movie and Game Night	Pizza and Presentation Practice	
7:30 PM					
8:00 PM					
8:30 PM					

Throughout the week, participants attended classes taught by faculty and graduate students from the six engineering disciplines involved in this program. While the goal was partially to provide students with a realistic college classroom experience, the classes were intended to be highly active and generally consisted of a short introductory discussion of the concepts involved, followed by an activity allowing students to explore the concepts more deeply or encouraging them to solve a small, open-ended design challenge. The “hands-on” activities as part of discipline-specific projects enabled better conceptualization of the ideas being discussed. The activities were structured to enable the participants to gain considerable understanding of the technological background prior to working on their assignments by providing them with the requisite information a day prior to the classroom lecture. This structuring was part of the flipped classroom paradigm where students are actively encouraged to be comfortable with concepts before discussing them in a classroom, thus providing an increased level of understanding and confidence and helping assimilation of abstract concepts⁶. Moreover, the course material was designed using Bloom’s taxonomy in order to provide clarity and reflect the scientific nature of the content¹⁰. As part of the in-class discipline specific activity, the students were divided into groups by the instructors and were asked to collaborate with group members in dealing with the engineering challenge at hand. This grouping was done to emphasize the importance and necessity of teamwork in engineering where cooperation impacts the productivity and performance of the team and also to implement the concept of cooperative learning^{2,14}.

Based on feedback collected from program participants, instructors, and counselors during the 2015 program, some changes were made to the 2016 program. The theme for 2016 was CO₂ capture, which apart from being a global problem was chosen in part because the participation of women in STEM is motivated by communal projects which yield benefits beyond commercial gains, such as by improving the quality of human life⁴. It also appeared based on the 2015 feedback that students most valued the opportunity to experience a variety of engineering disciplines. Because of this feedback, each discipline was covered during a two-hour class (rather than an 80-minute class as in the previous year). Making this change allowed time for students to learn about each discipline more deeply, to interact with individual instructors, and to spend more time on discipline-specific activities. Finally, the disciplines covered in the E-GIRL program changed slightly from 2015 to 2016. Whereas the 2015 program offered petroleum and electrical engineering as two of the disciplines covered, in 2016, these were replaced with chemical engineering and computer science to reflect the interests of program participants (note that computer science was also covered briefly in the 2015 program but was not included as one of the six disciplines). The following sections provide an overview of the material covered and activities completed during each of the six engineering disciplines.

Chemical Engineering

The chemical engineering course focused on the problem of CO₂ emission and its remediation through chemical processes. As part of the chemical engineering activity, the participants designed a model CO₂ sequestrations system for enhanced oil recovery. The course introduction began with a discussion of the role of chemical engineering in improving the quality of human life. Subsequent topics included the carbon cycle, chemical processes of CO₂ generation, and a description of technical principles dealing with capture and sequestration/conversion of CO₂.

The discussion of CO₂ capture and sequestration technologies focused on three main technologies, namely, CO₂ scrubbing using absorption, membrane-based gas-selective separation, and adsorption⁸. The three technologies were described in terms of their chemical operations and machinery to communicate the concepts of flow, pressure, temperature and chemical reaction and the applied nature of chemical engineering design. Thereafter, the entire process of on-site CO₂ generation and capture was explained followed by a description of the “Enhanced-oil-recovery” (EOR) process using captured CO₂. Considerable emphasis was given to the task of explaining the EOR process using CO₂ injection because it formed the central theme of the final hands-on activity which followed the explanation.

The chemical engineering activity comprised of designing a model CO₂ injection system for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) and combined elements of process design, pressure pumping, reaction kinetics and effect of pressure and temperature. An acid-base chemical reaction was used to drive CO₂ generation in one part of the experimental setup which also ensured that the CO₂ flowed under pressure while a separate component of the experimental setup was used to mimic a porous oil-rock formation which was connected to the upstream supply of the pressurized CO₂ from the reaction in the experiment. The oil from the reservoir was recovered with the progress of the CO₂ injection. The activity was timed from the start of CO₂ generation until the point where the oil flow into the storage reservoir stopped. The amount of oil recovered and the time taken was measured and recorded in a data sheet along with any other observations from the students. Every group was asked to conduct the experiment twice with a different set of conditions each time.

At the end of the activity, the data collected were shared among the groups. Simple questions were then posed based on the available data to engage the students and enable conceptualization of the activity. The students were then asked to brainstorm and come up with simple explanations for these observations.

Civil Engineering

Civil engineering is responsible for the design of the structure and infrastructure that provides access to the carbon capturing and sequestration facility, and providing access to said facility. A presentation was delivered to E-GIRL participants to explain the multiple civil engineering components that would be involved in the project, namely: structural engineering, transportation engineering, and geotechnical engineering. The presentation also provided information on the various industries where demand for civil engineers is high.

After the presentation, E-GIRL participants were introduced to the various civil engineering materials that are commonly used, such as concrete, asphalt, glass, and steel. Material samples were provided to participants so that they could inspect, compare, and contrast the physical properties of each material; for instance, comparing the weight difference between an aluminum rod and a steel rod of similar dimensions, inspecting the material composition of a concrete block, and observing the ductility of metal objects.

A discussion then followed to explain the importance of foundations to support heavy structures on the ground. The concept of engineering stress (defined as the applied load per unit area) was introduced to participants. Participants were provided with materials to perform a simple experiment illustrating the importance of foundations. In the experiment, participants placed a bottle – whose opened top was sliced off so that the bottle is supported on its rim – on a tub of dry sand. Weights were then placed on the bottom and participants observed how the bottle sank into the sand and also recorded the amount of settlement (the distance that the bottle sank into the sand). The experiment was then repeated, but this time a piece of wood was placed on the sand to model a foundation, and the bottle was placed on the piece of wood before weights were added. Through this experiment, participants learned that the concept of distributing an applied load over a larger area reduces the loading stress which resulted in negligible settlement even when similar loads were applied on the structure (in this case, the bottle was used to model the structure). This simple experiment demonstrated the importance of foundations and how weak soils are still able to carry heavy physical loads.

A worksheet containing questions based on the civil engineering materials discussion and the foundations experiment was provided to students to assess their understanding of the topics discussed and to document their observations in their own words.

Computer Science

The computer science topics focused on computational thinking for the data modeling of CO₂ emissions. Computational thinking was introduced by Jeanette Wing¹⁸ as the thought processes involved in formulating a problem and expressing its solution in a way that a computer, whether human or machine, can carry out. In addition, computational thinking involves the ability to choose abstractions that are appropriate to the problem and solution formulation, such as model choice and algorithm (set of steps) usage. Thus, the background in data modeling given to the students included a short introduction to programming using sequential, conditional, and looping statements, to familiarize the students with algorithm usage. To familiarize the students with models, the students were shown raw data with their corresponding representation as decision tree models and linear regression models to illuminate the different kinds of solutions available based upon model choice.

The computer science activities gave students practice in algorithms and data models. The first activity utilized the CS Unplugged (csunplugged.org) activity of guessing a number. Students represented the process of guessing as a binary tree to show how many guesses it would take to guess a number from 0 through 7 or from 0 to 15. They then ran an MIT Scratch (scratch.mit.edu) program while filling in the values of variables as the program proceeded to guess the number. Activity 2 had the students modify a Scratch program to play a simpler form of Jeopardy (jeopardy.com) with questions related to CO₂ emissions. The modification the students performed kept the game player from entering an invalid wager utilizing an if statement and then a looping statement. The final activity utilized raw data to model atmospheric temperature increases through linear regression as adapted from Witt¹⁹. The raw data consisted of 4 attributes related to CO₂ level, solar radiation, El Niño, and volcanic activity. The students investigated variable correlation and added one attribute at a time to the linear regression

equation to see how much better atmospheric temperature increases were modeled as each attribute was added.

Environmental Engineering

Water supply is a vital component to CO₂ capture. Adding CO₂ capture to a coal plant substantially increases its water use per watt. The environmental engineering class covered topics related to water quality, water sources, and membrane filtration technologies to provide the necessary water demand for carbon capture applications.

Membrane filtration technology and definitions were introduced to the students, followed by an in-class activity. The in-class activity asked students to (1) compare various membrane technologies (microfiltration, nanofiltration and reverse osmosis), (2) demonstrate the physical removal of water contaminants (i.e. suspended solids and total dissolved solids), and (3) calculate filter flow rate and flux rate from their individual filter apparatus. Students were then asked to select the membrane technology suitable for carbon storage applications based on a desired water quality.

Industrial Engineering

The theme selected for the industrial engineering workshop was 'Green Supply Chain Manufacturing through Lean'. The objectives of the session were multifaceted including the introduction to types of activities performed by industrial engineers, provision of an understanding of the green supply chain and lean manufacturing, and introducing the role of industrial engineering/ industrial engineers towards a greener organization. During the session, it was emphasized that in addition to designing an efficient structure, designing green and efficient supply chains for construction materials, operating and maintenance machinery and supplies, and carbon products is of extreme importance. For this purpose, green strategies followed at the site to ensure an efficient process, of lesser cost, and of higher quality were discussed.

The industrial engineering session also utilized a hands-on activity which required students to participate in a paper plane manufacturing simulation game. Students were grouped into two teams and each team was given instructions to produce the best quality paper planes within the given time. The simulation entailed two rounds, first one using the 'batch concept' and ordinary processing, second round utilizing 'one-piece flow concept' and many other lean manufacturing tools to demonstrate an efficient process producing quality output. Two rounds for the two teams were compared with each other. This exercise led to the identification of solutions to address areas of inefficiency (waste) in a process for a greener and more efficient process. The concepts learnt through the session were finally summarized at a final discussion session to keep the students aligned with the overall workshop objectives.

Mechanical Engineering

One major application of CO₂ capture is to reduce the CO₂ emissions from coal-based power plants. The mechanical engineering class covered topics in thermodynamics relevant to the operation of coal-based power plants and some considerations for implementing CO₂ capture in

these power plants. After a brief introduction to careers mechanical engineers can pursue and topics covered in the mechanical engineering curriculum, students were introduced to the steps required in the operation of a power plant through the Rankine Cycle. After some explanation and exploration of these steps, students were then taught about the definition of thermal efficiency and discussed how certain factors in the design and operation of a power plant may contribute to its efficiency as well as how thermal efficiency may relate to other forms of efficiency (generally, the ratio of the desired output to the required input) more familiar to them.

Related to these two topics, students then worked in groups to build a simple heat engine (the basis for the operation of a power plant). The heat engine used a candle to heat water contained in copper coils, creating steam and rotational motion. Students were then asked to think of an equation which might represent the device's efficiency and were asked to measure the device's efficiency and record their measurements on a data sheet. During the first half of the activity, students followed a set of directions to build their heat engines provided by the instructor; next, students redesigned their heat engines with the goal of increasing the device's efficiency. At the end of the class, students completed some questions to help them reflect on the activity and its connection to efficiency, the design process, and the operation of power plants, and the instructor led a brief discussion during which participant groups shared their results.

Analysis and Discussion

Several assessment methods were implemented to determine the effectiveness of the E-GIRL program with respect to the students' technical skill, self-efficacy, perceptions of engineering, and interest in engineering. Pre- and post-surveys were conducted asking program participants to rate engineering skills and provide some written responses about their interests and perceptions related to engineering. The pre-survey also collected demographic information and a set of factors which influence participants' interest in pursuing engineering. During their oral presentations at the end of the week, each group was rated by the six instructors on a scale from 1 (worst possible performance) to 4 (best possible performance) in categories related to delivery, content, and audience awareness. Participants also rated the instructors after attending each discipline-specific course.

Pre-Survey Participant Information

Figure 1 provides demographic information about program participants from the 2016 year. In total, 14 female students attended the program. The majority of the program's participants were Caucasian and were either 16 or 17 years old, coming from suburban communities. Both the demographics and number of participants differ from last year's program, where only 44% of students identified as Caucasian (in contrast to 56% from this year's program) and the program had a total of 37 participants. It is unclear why the number of students who participated in the 2016 program was smaller, as no significant changes to recruitment methods, cost, and time of year occurred between the two programs.

Information was also collected to determine possible reasons for program participants' interest in engineering. Figure 2 provides information about the motivating factors behind the students' interest in engineering (note that it was possible for participants to choose multiple

options). The most prominent motivating factors were related to personal interests (for example, a desire to help people or an interest in math and problem solving) while other factors, such as money or recommendations from family, were less powerful motivators. Among people who affected the participants' desire to pursue engineering, parents and teachers were most likely to influence students' decision to become engineers. Most program participants considered becoming engineers for the first time during middle school or early high school (ages 12-16), and roughly half of the students had participated in a STEM outreach program prior to attending E-GIRL.





Figure 1. (a) Community type; (b) age; (c) race or ethnicity of program participants


Students were also asked to rate their interest and level of success with math and science as well as their perception of the level of importance math and science have in engineering. Their responses are summarized in Table 2. On average, students have more interest and success in science than in math, but the average interest and success of students in both math and science are relatively high. While the level of importance of math in engineering matches well with students' interest and perceived success in math, the difference between students' interest and perceived success in science differs from their perceived level of the importance of science in engineering, even when the outlying values (shown in red) are neglected. It would be interesting to investigate this point further in the context of recruitment and retention of women in engineering. If more of an effort is made to emphasize the importance of science to engineering, female students may be more likely to pursue engineering since it will align more with their interests and perceived success.

What makes you want to be an engineer?



(a)

Who has been your single biggest influence to become an engineer?



(b)

Figure 2. (a) Factors affecting interest in engineering; (b) people affecting interest in engineering

Students were also asked to provide written responses highlighting the aspects of math and science they enjoy and those they do not enjoy. One aspect of math that many students appreciated is that there is always a right answer. While this point of view is not unexpected coming from high school students who are used to standardized tests, it is useful to note as a reason female students may be interested in engineering. Because it is rare for professional engineers or engineering students in upper level classes to encounter a problem with a distinct and identifiable right answer, the expectation of a right answer may lead to a lack of confidence or interest as they progress further in engineering. Program participants also noted that they enjoy that both math and science have real-world applications, and they tend to enjoy math and science more when those real-world applications are emphasized.

Table 2. Self-reported participant (n) ratings for math and science with respect to interest, success, and importance to engineering

Math Interest Score	n	Math Success Score	n	Math Importance Score	n	Science Interest Score	n	Science Success Score	n	Science Importance Score	n
1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	1
3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0
4	0	4	1	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
5	1	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0
6	1	6	1	6	0	6	1	6	0	6	1
7	4	7	2	7	3	7	6	7	5	7	3
8	4	8	5	8	5	8	0	8	2	8	6
9	1	9	2	9	0	9	1	9	3	9	1
10	3	10	3	10	5	10	6	10	4	10	2
Average	7.9	Average	8.0	Average	8.0	Average	8.4	Average	8.4	Average	7.0
Std. Dev.	1.5	Std. Dev.	1.7	Std. Dev.	2.4	Std. Dev.	1.6	Std. Dev.	1.3	Std. Dev.	2.6

Pre-to-Post Perceptions of Engineering

The pre-to-post survey requested written responses from program participants to the following two questions: (1) In your own words, define engineering; (2) Explain why you want to become an engineer. The instructors in E-GIRL performed coding and identification of recurring themes from these written responses. The diagram in Figure 3 represents the most commonly occurring themes for each of these responses in the pre- and post-surveys. For the question, “In your own words, define engineering,” there were few changes from the pre-to-post survey, with the exception that in the post-survey, several students mentioned specific disciplines of engineering in their responses. For this question, most students perceived engineering as a career which involves creativity, imagination, and problem solving, and which helps people. For the question, “Explain why you want to become an engineer,” a noticeable difference emerges. After the program, the percentage of responses indicating that participants want to become engineers to help people nearly doubled. It is possible that this result is tied to the theme for this year’s program which reflects environmentally-friendly interests and is likely to encourage program participants to consider solutions to problems which help the environment or help people.

Engineering Skills Assessment

Participants’ self-development score of engineering skills was assessed using a Likert scale included in a before-and-after questionnaire. This questionnaire is similar to the one illustrated in Yew et al.²⁰ with minor modifications made such that comparisons can still be made between previous results and current results, as well as maintaining consistency in the results to enable long-term analysis in the future. Fourteen student responses were collected before and after the program to evaluate their competency in eighteen skill sets that were identified to be important for engineers. A Wilcoxon signed rank test analysis was conducted to determine which skill sets recorded a statistically significant positive shift in perceived competency after the program.

Table 3 shows the statistical analysis of the engineering skills assessment with the Wilcoxon signed rank test results included.




Figure 3. (a) Responses to pre-survey questions; (b) responses to post-survey questions

Results, in general, show increases in self-efficacy scores in the engineering skills assessment although two skills in particular – utilization of resources and technical writing – recorded a decrease in self-efficacy scores. The skill associated with attention to details even remained the same before and after the program.

Participants recorded a self-efficacy drop in their capability to utilize resources possibly due to their roleplaying multiple engineering disciplines, such as a team member may need to roleplay a civil engineer and a mechanical engineer, while the other may roleplay an industrial engineer and a chemical engineer. With most participants taking up two engineering roles, most struggled with managing all the information provided by their instructors to decide which piece of information is pertinent to which discipline and for which aspect of the project.

Participants also recorded a drop in the self-efficacy scores related to technical writing skills. As high school students, participants are not likely to have experienced extensive practice in technical writing, and are likely to have inaccurately assessed their initial capability in technical writing. As participants went through lessons on communication skills, they might have a better

and more realistic understanding of their technical writing competency, which could have translated to a lower self-assessment of their technical writing skills.

Table 3: Statistical results of the self-reported engineering skills assessment

Skills	Before Camp		After Camp		% Increase
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Problem Solving Skills					
Ability to be creative	3.50	0.90	3.75	0.75	6.67
Think globally	2.91	1.16	3.83	0.94	23.91**
Think analytically	3.58	1.16	3.83	0.83	6.52
Attention to details	4.08	0.90	4.08	0.90	0.00
Technical understanding	3.17	1.27	3.75	0.62	15.56*
Math and science skills	4.00	0.74	4.08	0.67	2.04
Project Management Skills					
Organizational skills (tasks, deadlines)	3.92	1.31	4.25	0.62	7.84
Organizational skills (people)	3.33	1.23	4.00	0.85	16.67*
Time management	3.67	0.89	3.75	1.06	2.22
Utilization of resources	4.08	0.79	3.58	0.79	(13.95)
Teamwork					
Contribution to group tasks	4.17	1.19	4.33	0.89	3.85
Help with other tasks	4.00	1.04	4.25	0.75	5.88
Leadership skills	3.50	1.17	4.00	1.04	12.50*
Conflict resolution	3.50	0.90	3.92	0.67	10.64
Communication Skills					
Group communication	3.58	1.16	4.17	0.83	14.00*
Technical writing	3.58	1.16	3.25	0.75	(10.26)
Oral presentations	2.58	1.08	3.00	0.95	13.89
Listening skills	3.58	1.31	4.25	1.06	15.69**

* $p - value \leq 0.1$

** $p - value \leq 0.05$

Student Performance Indicators

Participants were assigned into four groups with six instructors evaluating the final oral presentations at the end of the program to determine whether participants addressed the objectives of the project adequately, eloquently, and professionally. The presentations were evaluated based on three criteria: delivery, content, and audience awareness. Each criterion bears a maximum possible of four points (the best performance), and the lowest rating possible for each criterion is one point (the poorest performance).

The grades for each group were collected from all instructors, compiled, and used to calculate summary statistics shown in Table 4. Average grades for each group range from a minimum of 66.7% to a maximum of 93.0%. The global average calculated from the averaged grades for each group is 83.0%. Overall, participants performed at least satisfactorily (i.e. a grade of 3 out of 4) in most of the criteria evaluated and could address the objectives of the project adequately.

Although two of the teams produced consistently above average results, participants mainly struggled with the open-endedness of the project where no one-size-fits-all solution exists. Students were challenged to justify their choice of solutions economically and scientifically – a task and skill that is not often developed or emphasized among high school students. For many participants, the open-ended nature of the project affected their confidence in their proposed solutions, but instructors repeatedly reassured participants that how participants feel about their lack of confidence is part of the learning and training to be engineers, and that an engineering student will eventually develop enough skills to be confident in his or her solutions. Participants' apprehension about the open-ended nature of engineering problems is a recurring theme as participants in the previous E-GIRL program also expressed the same concern.

Table 4: Summary statistics of student performance indicators

Team	Average grade (out of 12) n = 6	Average grade (%) n = 6
#1	8.00	66.7
#2	9.58	79.9
#3	11.17	93.0
#4	11.08	92.4
Summary statistics		
Mean	9.96	83.0
Median	10.33	86.1
Variance	2.23	155.1
Standard deviation	1.49	12.5

Course and Instructor Evaluation by Students

After attending each discipline-specific class, program participants were asked to rate both the instructor and the course on a Likert scale, where 1 corresponds to “Strongly Disagree,” and 5 corresponds to “Strongly Agree.” The results of these instructor evaluations are summarized in Table 5. Overall, the response to the discipline-specific courses was favorable, a trend which was also reflected in written comments by students. Two noticeable areas which may benefit from improvement include the clarity of instructions and time management on the part of the instructor. Although it can sometimes be difficult to predict how much time a particular group of students is likely to spend on a given activity, the issue of clarity may be addressed for future programs by including input on class content from others outside the instructor's field of expertise.

Table 5. Assessment of Instructors and Courses by Program Participants

Question	Average Rating
The instructor simulated student learning.	4.57
The instructor treated all students fairly and with respect.	4.92
The instructor allows you to be active in the classroom learning environment.	4.73
The instructor encourages students to speak up and be active in class.	4.50
The instructor welcomed and encouraged questions and comments.	4.54
The instructor is clear in giving directions and on explaining what is expected on assignments.	4.18
The instructor plans class time and assignments that help students to problem solve and think critically. Teacher provides activities that make subject matter meaningful.	4.36
The instructor emphasized the major points and concepts.	4.44
Overall, this instructor was effective.	4.49
The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject.	4.76
Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience.	4.63
The assignments and activities were relevant and useful.	4.62
Expectations were clearly stated either verbally or in the syllabus.	4.27
The workload was appropriate for the designated class time.	4.26

Conclusion

E-GIRL was a week-long, residential summer program provided for female high school students at TTU. The purpose of the program was to help participants gain knowledge about the role of engineers from a variety of disciplines in industry. Throughout the week, program participants attended courses for six engineering disciplines related to the unifying theme of CO₂ capture and storage. Participants also worked in teams to complete a group project related to this theme. In general, results showed an increase in self-efficacy and an enhanced understanding of the role of each engineering discipline covered in the program.

Based on feedback from the first year of the program, the most important changes for the 2016 year included the choice of a more altruistic theme and an extension of the time allotted for discipline-specific classes and activities. The choice of CO₂ capture as a theme aligned with the environmentally-oriented interests of program participants from 2015 and aligns with previous literature addressing the interests of women who pursue STEM careers. It was also clear from the feedback that participants valued the opportunity to gain experience with multiple disciplines of engineering. In both years, students expressed some discomfort with the open-ended project which may have occurred for a variety of reasons. First, the program occurred over a relatively short period of time during which students were often attending class or workshops. The small amount of time allotted to project work combined with the dense amount of information included in the program may have contributed to students' unease. Second, because several students highlighted confidence and enjoyment of mathematics in connection with "always having a right answer," the open-ended nature of the project also may have been a contributing factor. However, because realistic engineering problems almost never have a distinct and identifiable right answer, it is important for students to become comfortable with open-ended problems. It is unclear what steps may be taken for future program designs to address student feedback while

still maintaining the open-ended project component. One possible approach is to address the issue of open-ended problems transparently at the beginning of the program, explaining that open-ended problems are realistic, and an inability to identify a clear correct answer is normal and should not necessarily lead to a loss in confidence.

In addition to changes in the program structure, assessments may benefit from changes as well. For example, the assessments currently focus heavily on the academic components of the camp while omitting other valuable components (such as the social aspect). Future assessments may collect feedback on social and other aspects of the program. Additionally, it may be useful to follow up with program participants several months after the program to collect feedback. Allowing some time for reflection may lead to more useful information about participants' overall experience.

The analysis discussed in this paper enhances the understanding of how to increase women's participation in engineering through the results of the students' self-assessments and their conceptions of engineering. The issues identified in this study can inform decisions about a classroom atmosphere that specifically accommodates and address the needs and aspirations of women in engineering. The data collection and design of camp methodologies in E-GIRL can be implemented in the future design of engineering summer programs and can improve efforts to increase knowledge about the roles of specific engineering disciplines.

References

1. Beede, D. N., et al. (2011). Women in STEM: A gender gap to innovation.
2. Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of educational research*, 64(1), 1-35.
3. Corbett, C. and Hill, C. (2015). Solving the equation: the variables for women's success in engineering and computing. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.
4. Diekman, A. B., et al. (2010). Seeking congruity between goals and roles: A new look at why women opt out of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics careers. *Psychological Science*, 21(8), 1051-1057.
5. Education, U. S. D. o. (2014). Digest of education statistics, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).
6. Herreid, C. F. and N. A. Schiller (2013). Case studies and the flipped classroom. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 42(5): 62-66.
7. Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St Rose, A. (2010). *Why so few?* Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. American Association of University Women. 1111 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.
8. Institute, C. (2012). The Global Status of CCS: 2011 - Capture. from <http://hub.globalccsinstitute.com/publications/global-status-ccs-2011/31-capture#non-power-pcc-applications>.
9. Jones, M. G., Howe, A., & Rua, M. J. (2000). Gender differences in students' experiences, interests, and attitudes toward science and scientists. *Science education*, 84(2), 180-192.
10. Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(4), 212-218.
11. Monaco, P. A., Cloutier, A., Yew, G. Z., Brundrett, M. M., Christenson, D., Morse, A. N. (2016). Assessment of K-12 Outreach Group Project Highlighting Multidisciplinary Approaches in the Oil and Energy Industry, *2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana*.
12. National Research Council. (1991). Women in science and engineering: Increasing their numbers in the 1990s: a statement on policy and strategy. National Academies Press.

13. National Science Foundation, A., VA. (2000). Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 2000, ERIC Clearinghouse.
14. Smith, K. A. (1995). Cooperative learning: Effective teamwork for engineering classrooms. *Frontiers in Education Conference, IEEE*.
15. Thom, M., Pickering, M., Thompson, R. E. (2002). Understanding the barriers to recruiting women in engineering and technology programs. In *Frontiers in Education, 2002. FIE 2002. 32nd Annual* (Vol. 2, pp. F4C-F4C). IEEE.
16. Wang, M.-T. and J. L. Degol (2016). Gender gap in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM): current knowledge, implications for practice, policy, and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1-22.
17. Wilson, L. S. (1992). "The benefits of diversity in the science and engineering work force." *Science and engineering programs: On target for women*, 1-14.
18. Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational Thinking. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(3), 33-35.
19. Witt, G. (2013). Using Data from Climate Science to Teach Introductory Statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 21(1), 1-23.
20. Yew, G. Z., Monaco, P. A., Cloutier, A., Morse, A. N. (2016). Evaluation of interactive multidisciplinary curricula in a residential summer program, *2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana*.