

**Executive Summary of Summer II Evaluation Study**  
**Project SEED (1968-1994)**  
**June 1997**

In the Spring of 1997, SEED II participants were asked to complete a survey about their participation in the *second* eight-to-ten week summer science research internship sponsored by the American Chemical Society. The purpose of this survey was to obtain opinions about the second Project SEED summer internship program. A total of 261 surveys were mailed out with 98 returned for an overall response rate of 38%. The 1994 cohort had the highest return rate at 52%. SEED II survey respondents were 53% female, where 32% were White, 24% Hispanic and 22% African American. Male respondents were 42% White, 30% Hispanic and 16% Asian. As Figure 1 shows the gender distribution is similar to the SEED I participants, whereas there were more African American respondents (particularly female) among the SEED I respondents.

Three major reasons were checked for participating in SEED II: 1) *improve skills and abilities in science* (88%); 2) *develop interests in scientific/technical areas* (81%); 3) *needed a summer job* (61%). In terms of recommendations from others, the SEED I mentor was selected the most frequently (55%), teachers were next (31%) and recommendations from parents, counselors, friends and siblings were 28%, 15%, 11% and 7%, respectively.

Forty-nine percent of the SEED II respondents rated SEED II as better than SEED I, with another 44% rating the two programs about the same. Only seven percent rated SEED II as worse. In terms of self report regarding the impact on studying science, 92% of the respondents stated that SEED II increased their interest in studying science.

There were 10 opinion statements which were rated using a five point Likert scale (i.e., strongly agree to strongly disagree). The strongest positive opinions were expressed toward SEED II's impact on interest in science. For example 82% of the respondents said that SEED II provided a lasting stimulus for an interest in science. Related to this, 85% *agreed or strongly agreed* that SEED II changed their perceptions about what opportunities were possible for them. Finally, 88% of the respondents *agreed or strongly agreed* that SEED II increased their appreciation of the science around them.

The narrative records showed, among other things that SEED II provided more research opportunities for participants. Some example comments are:

*“I learned more about research, its significance, and how to apply research skills learned in SEED I.”*

*“There is nothing I could say that is negative about my SEED experience. Both SEED I and II had a major impact on my appreciation of science. SEED I introduced me to people and showed me what science is like on a working experience. SEED II set me on track, taught me science and chemistry combined, opened my eyes to a science world, opened many doors to research according to work experience.”*

*“As previously mentioned, my SEED II experience was better. That’s not to say that SEED I was bad, for it was also very good, but I had research experience in SEED II. I was more familiar with the subject matter, with the equipment, the people; was given greater responsibilities; and felt like I belonged. I was also more successful in my project for SEED II.*

Negative comments tended to deal with a mentor who was either disorganized, or took the SEED II intern for granted and did not assign them responsible duties. However, a majority of the narrative comments were positive. Additional comparisons to SEED I data are available.