

## **The MEP Census: Characterizing Essential Programmatic and Infrastructural Elements of Minority Engineering Programs (MEP) Nationwide**

**Prof. Jenni Buckley, University of Delaware**

Dr. Buckley is an Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at University of Delaware. She received her Bachelor's of Engineering (2001) in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Delaware, and her MS (2004) and PhD (2006) in Mechanical Engineering from the University of California, Berkeley, where she worked on computational and experimental methods in spinal biomechanics. Since 2006, her research efforts have focused on the development and mechanical evaluation of medical and rehabilitation devices, particularly orthopaedic, neurosurgical, and pediatric devices. She teaches courses in design, biomechanics, and mechanics at University of Delaware and is heavily involved in K12 engineering education efforts at the local, state, and national levels.

**Mr. Marcos Miranda, Ohio State University**

**Dr. Amy Trauth, University of Delaware**

Amy Trauth, Ph.D., is the Senior Associate Director of Science Education at the University of Delaware's Professional Development Center for Educators. In her role, Amy works collaboratively with K-12 science and engineering teachers to develop and implement standards-based curricula and assessments. She also provides mentoring and coaching and co-teaching support to K-12 teachers across the entire trajectory of the profession. Her research focuses on teacher education, classroom assessment, and P-16 environmental and engineering education.

**Ms. Marianne T. Johnson, University of Delaware**

**Dr. Michael L. Vaughan, University of Delaware**

Dr. Michael L. Vaughan is Associate Dean and faculty member at the University of Delaware, College of Engineering. In this role, he is responsible for the College of Engineering academic affairs enterprise. Dr. Vaughan manages the College of Engineering academic and educational support processes by developing and implementing policies, programs and interconnections to enhance the College ability to foster successful outcomes. Dr. Vaughan is a member of the College leadership team. The College current has over 2400 undergraduate and over 850 graduate students.

For many years, he has served as the Campus Principal Investigator of the NSF funded Greater Philadelphia Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation (LSAMP) Program and the NSF/AMP Bridges to the Doctorate Program, which focus on the success of students traditionally underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines. In addition, Dean Vaughan is the former Program Director/PI of the EAA/UD Graduate Preparatory Summer Residential Program funded by the Educational Advancement Alliance (EAA). The program includes up to 40 participants, rising juniors or seniors at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), who have interest in pursuing STEM disciplines at the graduate-level. Annually, Dean Vaughan supervises direction of the 4-week FAME/UD Summer Residential Program for 30-35 high school students, the RISE Summer Enrichment Program for incoming engineering freshmen and, in the past, the HEARD (Higher Education Awareness Response in Delaware) Project, a college awareness program, funded by the Department of Education through Philadelphia GEAR UP for College Network. Globally in the College, he manages academic programs and policies that impact the careers of all engineering students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Dean Vaughan is focused on enhancing the College's student/faculty interface by fostering successful academic and professional outcomes in an increasingly multi-cultural and diverse engineering environment.

Off campus, he is or has been a member of various professional associations and currently sits on numerous boards and committees that focus on engineering education and issues that positively impact the lives of young people. Dean Vaughan served on the National Executive Committee of the GEM Consortium in Alexandria VA which funds graduate degrees in Engineering and Science. Dean Vaughan is

a former President and former Treasurer of the Board of the GEM Corporation and past Chairman of the National GEM Investment Committee. Dean Vaughan was former Vice President of the board of directors and Operations Committee Chair of the National Junior Engineering Technical Society (JETS) based in Alexandria, Va. The JETS organization was a leading nonprofit educational enterprise dedicated to promoting engineering and technology careers to America's youth. Of the more than 40,000 students JETS served each year, 53 percent were from groups traditionally underrepresented in engineering and technology and 36 percent of participants were female. Dean Vaughan is a longstanding member of the President's Advisory Committee of the Girl Scouts of the Chesapeake Bay Council which encompasses girl scouting activities in all of the Delmarva Peninsula which includes Delaware, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and the Eastern Shore of Virginia. In addition, he is a former Board President of Delaware Futures of Wilmington, DE an organization which provides educational, social, and motivational support to high school students with unrealized potential to become successful college applicants. Dean Vaughan is also the convener and member of the External Advisory Board of HBCU-UP SMILE Project at Delaware State University which reports to the institution's president.

Dr. Vaughan received both his BS and MS in Electrical Engineering from North Carolina A&T State University and a Ph.D. in Civil Engineering from the University of Delaware.

**Tasha Zephirin, Purdue University-Main Campus, West Lafayette (College of Engineering)**

Tasha Zephirin is a Ph.D. Candidate in the School of Engineering Education at Purdue University. She is an Executive Assistant for the National Association of Multicultural Program Advocates (NAMEPA) Inc. and has served as the Graduate Student Representative on the Purdue Engineering Advisory Council. Her research interests include exploring the role of noncurricular engineering education initiatives in the engineering experience, especially within and across cultural boundaries. Through this research, she aims to inform the development and evaluation of these initiatives in a variety of contexts.

**Dr. Darryl Dickerson, Purdue University-Main Campus, West Lafayette (College of Engineering)**

Darryl A. Dickerson, PhD serves as Associate Director of the Minority Engineering Program at Purdue University and Chief Executive Officer of Advanced Regenerative Technologies. He received his PhD in 2009 from the Weldon School of Biomedical Engineering where his research focused on the development of naturally-derived biomaterials specifically for the regeneration of interfaces between hard and soft tissues. Subsequently, he founded BioRegeneration Technologies to translate the benchtop work performed during his graduate studies to clinical practice. During his time as a graduate student, Dr. Dickerson gained significant management and leadership experience as a member of the Board of Directors (2004 – 2009) of the National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE). His work with NSBE culminated in his service as President, Chairman of the Board, and Chief Executive Officer and the launch of the Summer Engineering Experience for Kids (SEEK) program in 2007 – 2008. In 2012, he joined the staff of the Minority Engineering Program at Purdue and has since taken on the role of Associate Director. In this capacity, he manages the staff members in executing programming designed to transform the College of Engineering into a more diverse and inclusive environment by increasing enrollment, retention, and success of underrepresented minority students in engineering.

**Prof. Rachel A. Davidson, University of Delaware**

Professor, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering Associate Dean for Diversity, College of Engineering Core Faculty Member, Disaster Research Center University of Delaware Newark, DE

# **THE MEP CENSUS: CHARACTERIZING ESSENTIAL PROGRAMMATIC AND INTRASTRUCTURAL ELEMENTS OF MINORITY ENGINEERING PROGRAMS (MEP) NATIONWIDE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

While students of color are broadly underrepresented in higher education, the issue is particularly acute in undergraduate engineering programs, where historically underrepresented students (URM, def: non-white, non-Asian) compose approximately 12-16% of the student body (1). Lack of diversity limits the talent base and creative capital of the entire engineering profession (2). For this reason, institutions have been investing in Minority Engineering Programs (MEPs) within their undergraduate engineering colleges (3,4). MEPs serve as umbrella organizations that offer financial, academic, and social support, with overarching objectives of improving representation and retention of URM undergraduate students in engineering programs (3-7).

Although programmatic elements and administrative infrastructure may vary by institution, there is no question that MEPs in general are effective in URM student retention and success (4-13). A whitepaper study conducted by the National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE) (4) studied four top-ranked MEP programs and recommended nine interventions for institutions to boost minority enrollment and retention. Six of the nine interventions traditionally fall in the purview of MEPs, namely, summer bridge programs, living-learning communities, facilitated study groups, scholarships, and positive development of self-efficacy and engineering identity. The success of these interventions in boosting minority enrollment and retention in engineering programs of study has been proven repeatedly in the literature (5, 10-13), with particularly strong evidence to support summer bridge programs (12) and intensive mentoring and academic supports (5, 10-14).

MEPs are loosely networked and may vary in terms widely across institutions. Professional organizations, such as the National Association of Multicultural Engineering Program Advocates (NAMEPA), and federally funded efforts like the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation (LSAMP), create an overlapping network for MEP administration and funding that includes approximately 60 institutions, representing only 20% of accredited engineering undergraduate programs (15). Even within these loose networks, MEPs operate independently of each other across institutions, with each having its own origins, unique programmatic offerings, and financial and administrative support structures (5). Beyond the few, model institutions studied by prior investigators (4,5), there is little information on current MEP practices and the variation in MEP structure across institutions. Such information would be inherently valuable in properly resourcing any national effort to encourage MEPs to adopt proven best practices (4, 5).

The goal of this study is to fully characterize the programmatic offerings and resourcing for MEPs nationwide. To truly understand the current landscape for MEPs, we employed a “census” approach, including in our study all sufficiently-sized, accredited, predominantly white (PWI) institutions in the US. We collected information about whether an MEP existed at a particular institution and, if so, what were its administrative structure and programmatic offerings. We further examined the correlation between these outcomes and URM representation in the undergraduate student body, hypothesizing that the existence and resourcing of MEPs will positively correlate with greater URM representation. The results of our census will be valuable

in future efforts to better network and disseminate established best practices (4, 15) across all MEPs nationally.

## METHODS

We employed a triangulated research approach that consistent of a core data set built from a web-based search of publically available information for particular institutions that we then cross-checked with voluntary surveys of MEP administrators. A single, validated instrument was used for both data collection arms (Table 1). This instrument was derived from two instruments used in prior studies that involved self-reported data from a small subset of MEPs (4, 15). Search terms for the web-based search included institution name, “minority,” and “engineering.” Three coders separately applied the search terms and instrument to 3% the institutions studied and achieved  $\kappa = 0.6$ , which suggests moderate agreement. A single coder was then used (intra-rater  $\kappa = 1.0$  for 3% subset) for the remainder of the data collection.

**Table 1:** Common instrument used in web-based searches and surveys.

Item No.	Outcome	Levels
1	Name of Institution	
2	Total No. Engineering Graduates <sup>1</sup>	
3	% URM Engineering Graduates <sup>1</sup>	
4	Presence of MEP Program <sup>2</sup>	Yes / No
5	MEP Program Name	
6	No. Years in Operation for MEP	Integer
7	No. Full Time Staff for MEP	Integer
8	Dedicated Student Space for MEP	Yes / No
9	Living Learning Community for MEP	Yes / No
10	Academic Support Services (tutoring, study hours) for MEP	Yes / No
11	Peer Mentoring Program specific to MEP	Yes / No
12	Staff / Faculty Mentoring Sessions for MEP	Yes / No
13	Scholarships for MEP	Yes / No
14	MEP-Specific Workshops & Networking Sessions	Yes / No
15	Summer Bridge Program for MEP	Yes / No
16	K12 Outreach Specific to URM and/or MEP	Yes / No
17	No. Programmatic Offerings <sup>3</sup>	Integer


<sup>1</sup>Data source is ASEE Data Mining Tool, accessed October 2017 (16).

<sup>2</sup>Presence of MEP Program assessed by a non-zero response to Item No. 5 through 9 or “Yes” response to one or more programmatic elements from Item No. 10 through 16.

<sup>3</sup>No. Programmatic Offerings is equal to total number of “Yes” responses for Item No. 10 through 16.

This census study was designed to collect information about MEP practices from domestic PWIs of sufficient size such that small fluctuations in the number of URMs present in these programs would not drastically affect percentile representation. Inclusion criteria for the web-based search were as follows (see also Figure 1): (1) ABET-accredited engineering program; (2) sufficiently large graduating class size (>25<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally); (3) moderate to high academic caliber (top 100 USNWR for doctoral-granting, top 50 for non-doctoral); and (4) neither historically black colleges and universities (HBCU) nor a Hispanic serving institutions (HSI). Institutions not meeting the third criteria but demonstrating top-quartile performance %URM in their engineering programs were re-admitted to the study population. The web-based

data set was cross-checked with a survey that was administered online or in-person using the common instrument (see Figure 1, right). The online surveys were sent to all MEP administrators within the NAMEPA network (ca. 60 institutions), and they were also administered in-person to individuals who did not complete the online survey at the 2017 NAMEPA annual conference.




**Figure 1:** Schematic of inclusion criteria for institutions in web-based data collection.

## RESULTS

Applying our screening criteria (see Figure 1), a total of 186 institutions (out of 275 total) were included in the web portion of this census. 15 MEP administrators completed the survey (25% response rate from NAMEPA members), with 9 completing online and 6 in-person. Agreement between web and survey outcomes was modest, ranging from 30-70% by institution. In general, web-based data collection underestimated programmatic offerings but accurately assessed resourcing levels compared to the surveys.

Of all the institutions in our census, 52.4% (n=97) had infrastructure and programmatic activities characteristic of an MEP. At institutions with MEPs,  $3.9 \pm 3.3$  (mean  $\pm$  st.dev) full-time staff were dedicated to the program; 19.5% had dedicated student space for their MEP; and 11.3% had an associated living learning community. With regards to programmatic activities (Figure 2), MEPs most commonly offered academic support services (56.7%) and workshops and networking sessions (54.1%) and least commonly offered peer (33.0%) and faculty/staff

mentoring (25.8%). MEPs offered  $3.1 \pm 1.9$  programs (out of 7 evaluated, see Table 1). Only 7.2% of all MEPs ( $n=7$ ) offered both summer bridge programs and living learning communities, as recommended by NAMEPA (4).



**Figure 2:** Percentage of MEPs nationwide offering particular programmatic elements.

The number of engineering graduates from the institution was moderately and positively correlated with the number of full-time MEP staff ( $r(97)=0.40, p=0.001$ ) and weakly and positively correlated with the number of programmatic offerings ( $r(97)=0.20, p<0.001$ ). Interestingly, there was a modest negative correlation between number of programmatic offerings and percentage URM in the undergraduate population ( $r(97)=-0.36, p=0.003$ ). No other statistically significant correlations were observed between numerical outcome measures.

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicate MEPs are only offered at half of the accredited engineering programs nationwide. For those programs with MEPs, staffing levels may be low and dictated more by the size of the overall undergraduate student body than the representation of students of color at the institution. Few MEPs provide program infrastructure other than staff support, with low rates of dedicated student work space and living learning communities. Academic support services and workshops are most commonly offered, with more costly programming, like summer bridge programs, being less common. Few of all MEPs, even those within professional networks like NAMEPA, are offering the entire suite of programmatic elements recommended in the literature (4,15).

There are both strengths and limitations to this census study that must be taken into account in interpreting and taking action based on this work. First, our common assessment instrument (see Table 1) was constructed based on common MEP characteristics from the literature (4, 15). However, we recognize that no instrument can capture all programmatic elements, especially those that are custom-designed to address the needs of a particular

institution, e.g., special sections of particular STEM coursework and/or articulation agreements with local HBCUs. This study was designed as a first-pass effort to broadly characterize the activities of MEPs and to assess alignment of common practices with accepted guidelines (4, 15). Secondly, the accuracy of methodology must be addressed. While we observed moderate to high inter and intra-rater reliability in web-based data collection, there was relatively poor alignment between web-based and survey data, with web data underestimating the number and variety of programmatic offerings. We attribute this discrepancy to a time lag in web updates for MEP programs; and anecdotally, we noticed that better resourced MEPs with a greater number of programmatic offerings had higher agreement between web and survey data.

Overall, this study provides strong evidence that few MEPs nationally are offering the recommended interventions to support underrepresented students within their programs, which may be due to insufficient resourcing. Future efforts should be directed towards institution and national-level advocacy for an infusion of resources into MEPs and guidance for these organizations to offer the recently recommended student interventions.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for summer internship provided by the UD Office of the Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion.

## REFERENCES

1. Yoder BL. Engineering by the Numbers. ASEE 2017.
2. Page SE. The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies. Princeton University Press; 2008.
3. Planning Commission for Expanding Minority Opportunities in Engineering. 1974. Minorities in Engineering: A Blueprint for Action: Summary and Principal Recommendations. New York, NY: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.
4. Ross M, Yates N. Paving the Way: Engagement Strategies for Improving the Success of Underrepresented Minority Engineering Students. National Society of Black Engineers 2016.
5. Frehill LM, Moving beyond the double-blind: WIE and MEP programs and serving the needs of women of color in engineering. 2008 Proceedings of ASEE.
6. Johri, Aditya, and Barbara M. Olds, eds. *Cambridge handbook of engineering education research*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. Ch.16
7. Ohland MW, Brawner CE, Camacho MM, Layton RA, Long RA, Lord SM, Wasburn MH. Race, gender, and measures of success in engineering education. *J Eng Educ*. 2011;100(2):225.
8. Meyer M, Marx S. Engineering dropouts: A qualitative examination of why undergraduates leave engineering. *J Eng Educ*. 2014;103(4):525-48.
9. Foor, C. E., Walden, S. E. and Trytten, D. A. (2007), "I Wish that I Belonged More in this Whole Engineering Group:" Achieving Individual Diversity. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 96: 103–115.
10. Seymour, E., & Hewitt, N. M. (1997). *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
11. Good J, Halpin G, Halpin G. Retaining Black students in engineering: Do minority programs have a longitudinal impact? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*. 2002;3(4):351- 64.
12. Kezar, Adrianna. "Summer Bridge Programs: Supporting All Students. ERIC Digest." (2000).
13. May, Gary S., and Daryl E. Chubin. "A retrospective on undergraduate engineering success for underrepresented minority students." *Journal of Engineering Education* 92.1 (2003): 27-39.
14. Lee, Walter C., Rachel L. Kajfez, and Holly M. Matusovich. "Motivating engineering students: Evaluating an engineering student support center with the MUSIC model of academic motivation." *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering* 19.3 (2013).15.
- Yoder B. Going the distance in engineering education: Best practices and strategies for retaining engineering, engineering technology, and computing students. *ASEE*. 2012.
16. Data Mining Tool. ASEE © 1998-2018. Accessed October 2017 at <http://edms.asee.org/session/new>