## Using a Summer Bridge Program to Develop a Situational Judgment Inventory: From Year 1 to Year 2

## Ms. Malini Josiam, Virginia Tech Department of Engineering Education

Malini Josiam is a Ph.D. candidate in Engineering Education and a M.S. student in Civil Engineering at Virginia Tech. She has a B.S. in Mechanical Engineering from UT Austin (2021). Her research interests include improving equity in engineering and sustainability.

## Dr. Walter C. Lee, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Dr. Walter Lee is an associate professor in the Department of Engineering Education and the director for research at the Center for the Enhancement of Engineering Diversity (CEED), both at Virginia Tech.



Hello everyone! Today we will present the work we've been doing related to developing an assessment tool called a Situational Judgement Inventory and present our preliminary findings from piloting our tool.



In order to fully contextualize our SJI instrument, we will first provide background information related to our research team, project context, and education plan. Then we will explain our process for developing the SJI and talk through some of our preliminary findings.



Our research team includes a range of contributors at different academic levels. Walt is the PI on the project and has several years of experience working in and understanding student support at the undergraduate and graduate level. Janice is a postdoc at FIU who contributed to the conceptual framing of this project. Malini has been leading data collection and data analysis for this project. Crystal contributed to early conceptualizations of the project. Taylor has contributed to data collection in the project. Finally, Artre was an undergraduate during his involvement in this project, and he analyzed the student data to develop the initial versions of the SJI instrument we will be discussing today.





Malini is a 3rd year PhD candidate in Engineering Education at Virginia Tech. Her engineering background is in Mechanical and Civil Engineering. She has been the Graduate Research Assistant on this project during her entire time at VT.

Award Abstract # 1943811 CAREER: Responsive Support SI Interrogation of Navigational S	ct Context	
NSF Org:	EEC Div Of Engineering Education and Centers	
Awardee:	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY	Responsive Support
Initial Amendment Date:	January 29, 2020	Structures
Latest Amendment Date:	June 30, 2021	for Marginalized
Award Number:	1943811	Students:
Award Instrument:	Continuing Grant	A Critical Interrogation
Program Manager:	Amelia Greer agreer@nsf.gov (703)292-2552 EEC Div Of Engineering Education and Centers ENG Directorate For Engineering	of Navigational Strategies
Start Date:	May 1, 2020	
End Date:	April 30, 2025 (Estimated)	
This materi 1943811. A those of the	al is based upon work supported by the Nai ny opinions, findings, and conclusions or re author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the	ional Science Foundation under Grant No. commendations expressed in this material are e views of the National Science Foundation. 6

The instrument we will be discussing today is situated within a CAREER project that started in spring 2020. This project focused on developing responsive support structures for marginalized students by understanding how these students navigate engineering. The SJI we will talk about is an assessment tool to hone in on the navigational part of this project.



In general, a CAREER grant is a five year grant that has one PI and a team of researchers. It also has an education plan which is supposed to be designed to improve the research to practice connection of the project.

EEC Div Of Engineering Education and Centers	<ul><li>5 year grant</li><li>One PI + Team of</li></ul>	
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY	Researchers	
January 29, 2020	Education Plan	
June 30, 2021		
1943811		galiens 61943 2
Continuing Grant		Same
Amelia Greer agreer@nsf.gov (703)292-2552 EEC Div Of Engineering Education and Centers ENG Directorate For Engineering		
May 1, 2020		
April 30, 2025 (Estimated)		
	EEC DY OF Engineering Education and Centers VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY January 29, 2020 June 30, 2021 1943811 Continuing Grant Amelia Greer agreerönsf.gov (703)292-2552 EEC Div Of Engineering Education and Centers ENG Divectorate For Engineering May 1, 2020 April 30, 2025 (Estimated)	<ul> <li>EC</li> <li>Div of Engineering Education and Centers</li> <li>One PI + Team of Researchers</li> <li>anuary 29, 2020</li> <li>June 30, 2021</li> <li>1943811</li> <li>Continuing Grent</li> <li>Amelia Greer agreenting Education and Centers</li> <li>EKO Div of Engineering Education and Centers</li> <li>EKO Div of Engineering Education and Centers</li> <li>Koy 1, 2020</li> <li>April 30, 2025 (Estimated)</li> </ul>

The SJI we developed is a key component of the education plan so we will explain this education plan in more detail now.



Within undergraduate engineering, there are several key stakeholders. In terms of our project concerned with undergraduate student navigation, the most relevant stakeholders are students and practitioners/administrators. Practitioners are advisors, student support staff like MEP/WMEP staff, instructors in first year courses, and mentors in mentoring programs to name a few. Administrators include program directors like MEP directors and undergraduate program coordinators. Students are undergraduate engineering students at all levels.

Between these two groups, there are a lot of assumptions about navigation and resources.



Knowing what resources they make available, practitioners and administrators assume the resources that students will and should use to address their needs an undergraduate engineering students. On the flip side, students also make assumptions, often about how useful resources will be and their availability. Students assumptions guide which resources they find out about and use, while practitioners assumptions guide what resources they tell students about and advocate for. In this model of assumptions, there is little room for tailored student support that anchors on the specific needs of particular students.



We believe that one way to improve alignment between practitioners and students is to develop an SJI that will illuminate the realities of navigation for specific students, eliminating the need to rely solely on assumptions to support students. Reducing assumptions required will lead to more responsive support - support that responds to students' actual behavioral patterns, rather than assumed navigational patterns.



To better illuminate how we plan to use an SJI to improve alignment between practitioners and students, I will explain more about what an SJI actually is. A Situational Judgement Inventory (SJI) is an assessment tool that has hypothetical scenarios a person is likely to encounter in a specific setting. In the case of our SJI, our setting is the undergraduate engineering learning environment within a university. For each scenario provided, there are multiple ways to respond to the scenario and the person taking the SJI is asked to judge the response options through forced choice or likert scale rating. SJIs are typically used to assess a person's judgement and/or problem solving skills.



To get a better understanding of what an SJI can look like, I will walk through the major components.



First, a prompt is given for students to understand how they should think about the scenario and select responses. In this example, the prompt asks students to select one response based on what they are most likely to do in response to the scenario provided. So the response selection allows students to only select one response option. In our SJI, scenarios are just one sentence and response options are equally brief.



With students selecting responses to scenarios, there is shared language for practitioners to start a conversation with students about responding to typical scenarios in undergraduate engineering. In that way, the SJI illuminates students' decision making for practitioners. Practitioners can use students' responses to scaffold conversations with students about their typical navigation strategies and expose them to new strategies. That way, students potentially learn about new resources and can discuss with their practitioner how they should access support based on their needs. The purpose of the SJI is to scaffold conversations between practitioners and students such that practitioners can provide more tailored support to students based on students' navigational tendencies.



Once we have fully developed and thoroughly tested our SJI, we plan to make it publicly accessible/available for practitioners/administrators to use with their students. It would become customizable in that practitioners can select which scenarios they want to include based on the scenarios they deem most relevant and helpful to providing support in their context. For example, an undergraduate engineering advisor may include all the scenarios, but an engineering career counselor may only include scenarios that are directly relevant to academic and professional development.



Now, I will discuss in more detail the development process of our SJI. In order to develop our SJI, we conducted workshops and interviews with incoming and current engineering students at our institution and asked them to respond to specific common scenarios through open ended responses. Through a process we will explain in the next several slides, we took these open ended responses and turned them into closed ended responses to develop our SJI instrument.

		_
Connertie	Scenario Domains	
Domains	Academic	
	Performance	
	Faculty and Staff Interactions	
	Extracurricular	
Situational Judgement	Involvement	
Inventory (SJI)	Peer-group	
	Interactions	
	Professional	
	Development	
	Special	
	Circumstances	В

The scenarios fell into six different domains or types. The domains came from Lee, W. C., Hall, J. L., Godwin, A., Knight, D. B., & Verdín, D. (2022). Operationalizing and monitoring student support in undergraduate engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *111*(1), 82–110. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20431</u>

	Domain	Scenario
Examples	Academic Performance	You are at the risk of failing a required course and
	Faculty and Staff	You are performing poorly in a class due to poor teaching by instructor or GTA
Situational Judgement	Extracurricular Involvement	You are active in an organization and the time commitment proves greater than expected
Inventory (SJI)	Peer-group Interactions	You are finding yourself too busy to socialize and feel disconnected from people in general
	Professional Development	You no longer think engineering is the major for you and want to explore other options
	Special Circumstances	You have family or personal problems that are distracting you from school

We started by developing a list of 24 scenarios. We developed this list of scenarios by looking at prior research on common obstacles and challenges within an engineering and college learning environment. The students in the workshops and interviews responded to open ended scenarios that we pulled from this list.



Once we had the list of scenarios finalized, we were able to show a selection of scenarios to students to respond to which is how we began to develop the response items on the SJI.



At the workshop, we collected written student responses. We asked each student to respond to 4 scenarios, from four different domains, individually and then discuss those responses with a group to come up with a group response.



We then digitized all of these responses - group responses and individual responses for every scenarios.



Then, for each scenario, we aggregated all student responses we received and listed them out.



From there, we developed a higher level category structure that these options fell into using ChatGPT and prior research.

Developing	Categorized Response Options
Response Items	You are at the risk of failing a required course and the withdraw/drop
	deadline is approaching
	<ul> <li>A. Wait and see how you're doing in the course once the deadline is closer (no support, no action)</li> <li>B. Focus more in class (self support)</li> <li>C. Spend more time studying for the course (self support)</li> <li>D. Go to the instructor's office hours to get help with the material you are struggling with (academic support)</li> <li>E. Talk to your instructor about dropping the course (academic support)</li> <li>F. Ask your instructor for extra credit opportunities to bring up your grade</li> </ul>
Situational Judgement	(academic support)
Inventory (SJI)	<ul> <li>G. Seek out help from a peer who has taken the course before (academic peer support)</li> </ul>
	H. Make a study group with peers in the course (academic peer support)
	<ul> <li>I. Ask your academic advisor for advice about dropping the course (campus resource)</li> </ul>
	<li>J. Visit the <i>Student Success center</i> to learn how to improve your grade (campus resource)</li>
	<ul> <li>K. Call/text a friend who has been in a similar situation to hear what they did (social support)</li> </ul>
	<li>Call/text your family or a trusted adult to confide in them and get support (mental support)</li>
	M. Drop the course immediately (no support action)
	25

Finally, we sorted the organized responses into each response option category, making sure that each response option was only one action. Given the varying domains of scenarios and relevant responses, some of the scenarios have several response options within the same response option category and/or some response option categories are skipped altogether. We used our prior knowledge of student support to make these decisions.



We used this multi-step process for each scenario and developed a succinct list of closed ended response options for each scenario. These scenarios and response options were uploaded into a google form.



We piloted our instrument with 44 incoming engineering students in August 2023 using 12 scenarios.

Now we will present some of our findings. We are interested in hearing your reactions to what you see on the next several slides.

A note on the quantitative analysis - since our instrument is still under development and the data is pilot data, we did not conduct statistical analysis on the collected data. We were more interested in using the pilot data to refine our instrument in terms of quality and quantity of response options and scenario wording.



The first pattern we will highlight is that different scenarios elicited different response patterns from the group of students we sampled. For example, in the scenario "You are having a difficult time finding an internship or co-op opportunity and are unsure why" we see that students overwhelmingly selected one answer choice which entails visiting the campus career center. However, this unitary response pattern was not reflected through all of the scenarios. For example, the bottom scenario related to having interests outside of engineering with limited time elicited two dominant responses from students - waiting (aka doing nothing) or talking to their academic advisor.



We also found other response patterns. The top scenario related to being under a high level of stress had four responses that were selected relatively equally across participants which included scheduling a counseling appointment, going for a walk, prioritizing time for self-care, and continuing to work hard until the end of the semester. The bottom scenario was even more contested with 6 options selected by a few students. Even though this is an academic scenario, there was limited consensus on navigating this situation.



Based on what we've shared so far, what thoughts or reactions do you have? e.g., Are you surprised or not surprised by the variation in the response patterns?



When we piloted this instrument, we also collected demographic information but we suspected that responses might differ across demographic groups. Now we will share some of those findings.



But first, for context, our sample included 13 women, 31 men, and 1 person who identified as gender NB/genderqueer. In terms of race and ethnicity, our sample had 10 students who selected multiple racial/ethnic categories, 16 White students, 5 latine students, 8 Black or African American students, 1 African student, and then 1 student in each of the following categories: SE Asian, E Asian, S Asian, and Middle Eastern or North African student.



Furthermore, the sample was a little over half first generation college students (51%).



First we will walk through some of the scenario results by gender.

Your first round of tests did not go we and your usual studying habits are no working	ll t		
Your first round of tests did not go well and your usual studying habits are not working	Man	Woman	Grand Total
Ask other students who did well on the tests about how they prepared		7.69%	2.27%
Make an appointment with Cook counseling or TimelyCare to take care of your mental/emo	3.23%		2.27%
Meet with your advisor to create a time management plan	3.23%		2.27%
Review your first round of tests once you get them back to understand your mistakes	25.81%	15.38%	22.73%
Spend more time studying for your next tests	6.45%	23.08%	11.36%
Start going to office hours regularly for each of your courses	19.35%	7.69%	15.91%
Talk to your instructors about your tests to understand what you did wrong	12.90%	15.38%	13.64%
Try a new study method for your next round of tests	9.68%	23.08%	13.64%
Visit the Student Success Center to learn a new study method	16.13%	7.69%	13.64%
Wait until the next round of tests to see if you'll do better	3.23%		2.27%
Grand Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Women's top two choices:	len's top t	wo choice	s:
1. Spend more time studying for 1. Rev	'iew your f	irst round	of tests
your next tests	once you	get them b	back
2. Try a new study method for your 2. S	tart going	to office h	nours
next round of tests	re	gularly	
		-	31

I will show response patterns across a few scenarios for the sake of highlighting one way to look at the results. I chose to highlight the top two responses for each group. Other ways to look at the results could be to look at the most selected and least select choices or look at patterns at the individual scale of the response categories a student may gravitate towards.

For all of the examples, each demographic category is shown as percentages out of 100% because there were a different number of people in each category.

So in this example, we can see that while almost  $\frac{1}{2}$  of women said that would respond to a situation of having weak performance on their first round of test by spending more time studying or trying a new study method (utilizing self support), while less than 20% of men choose this option. Instead,  $\frac{1}{4}$  of men said they would review their tests once they got them back or start going to office hours. In this example, men chose a response that involves external support rather than self support.



For this scenario, we see that men and women answered relatively similarly, with their top choice if they are feeling socially isolated being to join a student organization outside of engineering.



Next, we disaggregated the data by race, specifically identifying groups that are typically targeted by support programs and research.



First, we looked at how Black students responded compared with all other students. Response patterns were mostly similar except the top choices by both groups were different. Black students' top choice was to reach out to the TA while other students' top choice was to find instructional videos to watch online



For this scenario, response patterns varied more between the Black students and the other students. While the Black students top choice was to try to not compare themselves to their peers, other students' top choice was to go to office hours to get help, a choice that was in the bottom 4 for the Black students. This is a situation where Black students recognizing they may face additional obstacles in engineering so they shouldn't compare themselves with their peers may hold them back from seeking out help. Information like this could be useful for practitioners to identify and address beliefs related to academic performance and support.



Then we looked at some scenarios disaggregated by Black or Latinx students (included multiracial students) and other students. Here we found that the top choices by both groups were different with no overlap between groups in the to choices.





-being B	lack or Latinx	Other	Grand Total
me and stress		9.52%	4.55%
	13.04%	23.81%	18.18%
	26.09%	28.57%	27.27%
	34.78%	9.52%	22.73%
		9.52%	4.55%
ith your assignm	ent deadlines	4.76%	2.27%
ake care of yc	26.09%	14.29%	20.45%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<u>.</u>			
t	ime and stress vith your assignm take care of yc	ime and stress 13.04% 26.09% 34.78% vith your assignment deadlines take care of yc 26.09% 100.00%	ime and stress 9.52% 13.04% 23.81% 26.09% 28.57% 34.78% 9.52% 9.52% vith your assignment deadlines 4.76% take care of yc 26.09% 14.29% 100.00%

For this scenario, there were more response similarity between groups. Both groups mostly selected self support options in the top two choices; however, for Black and Latinx students, scheduling a counseling appointment also made it into the top 2.



Since our instrument is still under development and the data is pilot data, we did not conduct statistical analysis on the collected data. We were more interested in using the pilot data to refine our instrument in terms of quality and quantity of response options and scenario wording. Since our data is relatively small and concentrated to an incoming engineering student population, we can't assume that the preliminary patterns we found in the data represent broader trends. However, based on these initial results, we can begin to see that different students do have different navigation patterns, illuminating the need for more tailored/responsive support to different groups.

We anticipate our pilot results could prime you to think about ways you could use this type of data in your context and how you may choose to look at trends across students.



Based on your own experiences and expertise, what are your immediate reactions to these results? Are they surprising or not surprising? What are you curious to know more about?



Through piloting our instrument, we gained a lot of insight about how to move forward with developing our SJI. We found that having more than seven response options was too overwhelming for students to choose from, so moving forward, we will standardize the scenarios to have just five response options. We also found that students wanted to select multiple options because they are likely to take multiple actions in response to a scenario, so we plan to update the instrument to allow for students to select multiple response options for one scenario. We will also reduce the scenario list 19 - 3 scenarios in the first 5 domains, and 4 special circumstance scenarios.

There are a lot of possibilities for analysis moving forward. The analysis we presented here is just a starting point. We believe we could uncover even more interesting insights by analysis the response selections by their response categories in order to compare response patterns across scenarios. This type of analysis could be further augmented by disaggregating these response patterns across scenarios by demographics. We believe we could use response category patterns as a way to develop profiles for students so they get immediate feedback from the instrument about their dominant responding tendencies, if they have one. For example, that could sound something like "in academic scenarios, you have a tendency to use self support." Once we test out the updated instrument, we will conduct statistical analysis on the full data set to verify the utility of our instrument.



We have already made updates to our SJI. First, we changed the response format to allow students to select least likely and most likely response. Increase the response ability will provide more response variety and tell us more about the response options and their utility.



We also updated the response options to standardize the number of responses per scenario to five. In order to do this, we first revisited the response option categories and aggregated them to five. We believe these five categories capture the original nine categories. Now every scenario will have one of each response category where relevant or a repeat response category when all response categories are not relevant.



Through piloting our instrument, we gained a lot of insight about how to move forward with developing our SJI. We found that having more than seven response options was too overwhelming for students to choose from, so moving forward, we will standardize the scenarios to have just five response options. We also found that students wanted to select multiple options because they are likely to take multiple actions in response to a scenario, so we plan to update the instrument to allow for students to select multiple response options for one scenario. We will also reduce the scenario list 19 - 3 scenarios in the first 5 domains, and 4 special circumstance scenarios.

There are a lot of possibilities for analysis moving forward. The analysis we presented here is just a starting point. We believe we could uncover even more interesting insights by analysis the response selections by their response categories in order to compare response patterns across scenarios. This type of analysis could be further augmented by disaggregating these response patterns across scenarios by demographics. We believe we could use response category patterns as a way to develop profiles for students so they get immediate feedback from the instrument about their dominant responding tendencies, if they have one. For example, that could sound something like "in academic scenarios, you have a tendency to use self support." Once we test out the updated instrument, we will conduct statistical analysis on the full data set to verify the utility of our instrument.



These are key references we used to develop an understanding of SJIs and develop our instrument.



Thanks for listening to and engaging with our presentation. Let us know if you have any further questions or comments and feel free to reach us via email.



The students in the workshops and interviews responded to open ended scenarios that we pulled from this list. We developed this list of scenarios by looking at prior research on common obstacles and challenges within an engineering and college learning environment. These scenarios fell into six different domains or types.