

SEEK Evaluation Report

Submitted to the National Society of Black Engineers
By Grace Carroll, Ph.D. and
Caryn T. Walker, Ph.D.
September 10, 2007

Carroll Consulting
744 Walavista Ave.
Oakland, CA 94610
gracecarroll@earthlink.net



Table of Contents

Introduction/Background	Page 2
Training	Page 3
Parent Profile	Page 4
Students' Reflection	Page 7
Mentors' Reflections on Students	Page 9
Mentors' Evaluation of Overall Program	Page 11
Summary and Recommendations	Page 14
Attachment I – Full training evaluation data set	Page 16
Attachment 2 – Weekly data tables of Mentor Feedback Re: Classroom Environment	Page 31

SEEK Evaluation Report

Introduction/Background

- I The National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE) has always engaged pre-collegiate students in its programs. However, in 2003 the Long Range Planning Taskforce hired a consultant to research and articulate a plan for NSBE based on NSBE's stated mission. This plan called for an expansion of NSBE's outreach and provision of educational services to younger students. Specifically, it was recommended that NSBE create educational programs and services to impact third and fourth grade students in order to fulfill its mission to 'increase the number of culturally responsible Black engineers.'¹

The Summer Engineering Experience for Kids (SEEK) Camp was created for third through fifth grade students as part of the NSBE's long range plan to impact younger students. The SEEK Camp was a three-week summer program designed to afford current third- through fifth grade participants greater exposure to science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. A pilot SEEK program was implemented at Friendship Edison School in Washington, D.C. from July 9th through 27th, 2007. Members of NSBE and Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) International led approximately 250 participants in classroom exposure to STEM fields, research and mentorship. The young students worked within classroom teams to research and design vehicles to be used in competition at the end of each week. The weekly classroom activities were designed to engage the students in learning, understanding, and creating a competitive Skimmer, Jet Toy and a Steel Can Rover over the three week duration. In addition, students were exposed to physics, field trips that explored their area of study for the week and were given opportunities to network with undergraduate, graduate and professionals in scientific areas. Program goals included:

- Exposing youth to science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields at an early age;
- Daily hands-on activities to engage students in engineering design; and
- Fulfill the mission to increase the number of culturally-responsible Black engineers who excel academically, succeed professionally and positively impact the community.

Students from Friendship Edison School were given the first opportunity to pre-register for the program before applications were provided to the general public. The target of 300 student applicants was easily reached. Admission to the pilot program was free. Parents were responsible for bringing their children to the program between 7:30 am-8:00 am and picking them up between the hours of 4:00pm-5:00 pm. Classes convened from 8:30am-3:00 pm each day. In addition, breakfast and snacks were provided daily. Students were asked to bring their own lunch.

NSBE members were solicited via email to participate as mentor/teachers in the SEEK program. The goal was to have a one-mentor to four-student ratio. A

¹ Information retrieved from presentation made to the National Executive Board, Sept. 2003

typical classroom setting would include approximately four to five mentor teams with 16 to 20 respective students. Each mentor was to become an expert in one of the three project areas (i.e., Skimmer, Jet Toy or Steel Can Rover). The students would work with a new mentor-expert each week as they rotated among the three project areas. Thus, each student participant would have had contact with three mentors over the course of the summer program and each mentor would have had contact with approximately twelve different students. Mentors participated in a three-day training prior to the SEEK program commencement, from July 6th through 8th, 2007. Mentors were selected from various locations across the country and were housed at Howard University for the duration of the program.

Ttraining

The mentor training was very intense and began on Friday, July 6th at 9:00 am. The first morning consisted of discussions and group activities to help the mentors better understand the context and environment of the participants and the different stressors they may encounter as young Black students. The morning objectives were for the mentors to:

- **Become acquainted with the theoretical concepts of symbolic interaction and Mundane Extreme Environmental Stress (MEES);**
- **Further understand the complexities of living within the context of race and racism, and the individual and collective toll they take on individuals;**
- **Reflect on how these factors impact 'schooling' and the education of young Black students; and**
- **Review response modes and strategies for coping with MEES.**

Mentors also visited the school site in the afternoon where they received continued training. The afternoon session activities, discussions and reflections entailed:

- Reviewing issues contributing to school/classroom climate;
- Sharing strategies for classroom management;
- Sharing strategies for classroom instruction/tutorial; and
- Providing a forum for sharing and contributing as a 'professional learning community'

On the second day, the SAE staff divided the mentors into three groups. Each group was to become 'expert' in their respective project design area (i.e., Skimmer, Jet Toy or Steel Can Rover). The mentors received training on key vehicle operational concepts and how to assist their students in vehicle design. On the final day, the SAE training continued and the mentors participated enthusiastically in competitions which would be mirrored by their mentees each Friday of the SEEK program. The training addressed mentor expectations and included an operations meeting with NSBE staff members.

The mentors completed an evaluation of the three-day training sessions on the last day of training. The evaluative form was designed by an external evaluator to assess mentors' feedback of the usefulness of training materials and format. The responses indicated that the mentors appreciated the training and

felt they gained valuable and relevant information and resources. They also felt prepared for their roles as teachers and mentors. A detailed report of the mentor training evaluation was previously submitted to NBSE staff at WHQ in July 2007. Duplicate tables of data responses are included in Attachment I of this report.

Parent Profile

Parents were asked to complete a demographic form that also assessed their perceptions of their children's interest in math/science during on-site registration on the first day of class. One hundred and forty demographic forms were obtained. Tables 1-7 display the frequency of responses for the survey items. As illustrated in Table 1, most parents learned of the SEEK program from a friend or relative (65.7%), followed by 'other', such as, email, online message board, NSBE member, and alumni (19%), and school notice (17%).

Table 1
How did you find out about SEEK?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	.7	.7
Friend	71	50.7	51.4
Relative	21	15.0	66.4
Advertisement	3	2.1	68.6
School Notice	17	12.1	80.7
Other	19	13.6	94.3
Friend & Email	8	5.7	100.0
Total	140	100.0	

Table 2 shows the vast majority of responding parents (predominately mothers) ranged in age from 31 – 45 with a modal age range of 36 – 40 years old. Spouses' ages (see Table 3) are distributed more evenly from 31 – 50 years of age.

Table 2

Parent's Age Range

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	26-30	17	12.1	12.1
	31-35	34	24.3	36.4
	36-40	38	27.1	63.6
	41-45	31	22.1	85.7
	46-50	14	10.0	95.7
	55+	6	4.3	100.0
	Total	140	100.0	

Table 3**Spouse's Age Range**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	26-30	8	5.7	10.4
	31-35	13	9.3	27.3
	36-40	18	12.9	50.6
	41-45	19	13.6	75.3
	46-50	15	10.7	94.8
	55+	4	2.9	100.0
	Total	77	55.0	
Missing	System	63	45.0	
Total		140	100.0	

Seventy-eight of the responding parents resided in Maryland (55.7%) and 47 resided in Washington, D.C. (33.6%), and three lived in Virginia (2.1%). Regarding education, most of the parents (90%) and half of the spouses (50%) were fairly well-educated, having some college or more (see Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4**Parent's Education**

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Some high school	1	.7	.7
	High School	12	8.6	9.4
	Some college	62	44.3	54.0
	Bachelor's degree	48	34.3	88.5
	Graduate degree	16	11.4	100.0
	Total	139	99.3	
Missing	System	1	.7	
Total		140	100.0	

Table 5

Spouse's Education

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High School	16	11.4	18.6
	Some college	28	20.0	51.2
	Bachelor's degree	31	22.1	87.2
	Graduate degree	11	7.9	100.0
	Total	86	61.4	
Missing	System	54	38.6	
Total		140	100.0	

The majority of parents and many of their spouses were employed. Forty-two percent of the parents reported a spouse occupation. This dual income was reflected in an average income of the participating families of \$60,000. Parents and spouses were employed from diverse occupational fields. Sales and administrative positions were the modal positions reported. Three parents and four spouses were reported as engineers. Four parents/spouses were reported as stay-at-home parents and two were currently unemployed. Over a third of the students were from families reporting a total family income over \$90,000 per year (see Table 6). Seventy-seven percent of the families had three or fewer children (see Table 7). Thus, this sample is predominately composed of middle-class families.

Table 6

Income Level

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below \$20,000	8	5.7	6.0
	\$20,000-\$29,999	3	2.1	8.3
	\$30,000-\$39,999	10	7.1	15.8
	\$40,000-\$49,999	14	10.0	26.3
	50,000-59,999	20	14.3	41.4
	60,000-\$69,999	11	7.9	49.6
	\$70,000-\$79,999	10	7.1	57.1
	\$80,000-\$89,999	6	4.3	61.7
	\$90,000-\$99,999	20	14.3	76.7
	\$100,000+	31	22.1	100.0
	Total	133	95.0	
Missing	System	7	5.0	
Total		140	100.0	

Table 7

Number of Children

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	35	25.0	26.1
	2	42	30.0	57.5
	3	31	22.1	80.6
	4	19	13.6	94.8
	5	4	2.9	97.8
	7	2	1.4	99.3
	8	1	.7	100.0
	Total	134	95.7	
Missing	System	6	4.3	
Total		140	100.0	

Parents' perceptions of their child's interest in math and science were assessed. The majority shared that their child was interested or very interested in math (68.6%) and science (81.5%). Most parents indicated that their children did not know what an engineer was (55.7%), and had never met an engineer (53%).

Students' Reflection

In the mentor training, mentors were engaged in many reflection activities. Research indicated that too often students are not afforded sufficient time to engage in honest reflections of their learning and educational experiences. Thus, as part of the daily curriculum, students were introduced to the concept of reflection and were asked to reflect on three things: 1) what they liked best about the day; 2) what they didn't like about the day; and 3) what they learned new that day. The Student Daily Reflection Form is presented below.

SEEK Student Daily Reflection Form

 What I liked best!	
 What I didn't like.	
 What I learned new	

Although the forms were not completed daily for each student, over two hundred forms were obtained.

Concerning the students' preferences, over a quarter of the students shared that they truly liked the hands-on activities and manipulations involved in designing, building, and testing their vehicles as indicated by the following sample of statements:

- Testing the skimmer
- Making the skimmer
- Watching the skimmer
- Designing the car
- Making it [jet toy] sail
- I liked testing the rover
- I liked designing the rover
- I liked re-making the rover
- I liked building the rover
- Decorating the rover
- Making the rover bigger and better

Students also enjoyed their experiences conducting presentations. One student responded, 'My presentation!!!' Their enthusiasm about their presentations and the competition overall was also represented in their comments in this section. The mentors were also a highlight for many students. One student was happy that 'everyone was nice to me.' Others mentioned making new friends and a few shared they enjoyed the food and the movies.

Regarding dislikes, the majority of the students shared that there was nothing about their day they didn't like. However, some students felt that there were some rude and mean persons in the program and a few had altercations with other students during the day which influenced their responses. Others mentioned they were confused that day concerning what to do with their vehicle. One wanted to have more 'free time.' Of course, there were some students that didn't like the food.

Most of the reflections pertaining to new things learned focused on vehicle design and construction. A sample of responses is as follows:

- How to test my skimmer
- How to make my car work better and go faster
- How to fix my car if it goes slow
- More about cars
- I learned when to change the rubber box
- How the wheels affect the rover
- That certain parts make the rover go fast and far
- Weight can slow things down
- How to make a steel can rover and how it goes slow, fast and oscillates
- I learned about different kinds of nails and nubs

It was also evident in these responses that students were learning about the research experience:

- I learned hypothesis
- I learned how to graph and line plot far, slow, fast, weight
- I learned that accuracy means go straight
- I learned new things about when testing the rover and comparing and testing
- I learned how wheels affect the rover
- I learned about testing
- When to use a hypothesis and a graph
- How to write a prediction and check it

- I learned about presenting
- Writing is important

Students also learned about the NSBE mission and math/science formulas (i.e., cm²). Only a few students felt they didn't learn anything new on a particular day.

Mentors' Reflections on Students

Mentors were asked to keep weekly notes on the activities, student experiences and reflections of the program. Various themes emerged from the analysis of these notes.

1. Behavior – Many of the mentors experienced children with social and/or behavioral challenges; some with learning and attention challenges, anger and aggressive behaviors or extreme shyness. Mentors did not feel they were prepared to effectively respond to these children's needs nor had prior notification that such issues would arise. It was recommended that in the future, such issues should be disclosed by parents during the application process in order that the mentors may receive adequate training and preparation before the start of the program to appropriately address the needs of their students.

2. Late Start Students – There were students that began the program days after it started causing mentors to provide crash courses to bring the late arriving students up to speed. This occurrence interrupted scheduled class instruction and became a distraction for the others in the group. This was very problematic particularly for young students. Also, the late arriving students needed greater time to assimilate into the classroom environment than students who began on the first day. Some of the late starting students also experienced difficulty catching up and socializing with the children who began earlier.

3. Promises Not Kept – In an effort to provide the children with an incentive to winning the competition, Brother ED promised to give \$100 to the winning group. This did not happen (or perhaps it happened after the program?). It is suggested that maybe ribbons/trophies could be presented to the winning groups in the future. In the case of the trophy, maybe NSBE can provide a number of small trophies to the winning group or provide a big trophy that would actually stay with the camp until the following session and make plaques (name plates can be done on card board paper) stating the name of the group (that is, if the group is named), along with the date they won the competition, to signify the group who won and then name them the champion until the next group wins. With every winning group a name goes under/above the previous winning groups' title. The ribbons can be passed out as a constellation prize to all those who participated with the NSBE logo as well as year, as a keepsake to those who participated but did not win. Not only will the kids come back and see that they were apart of the competition, but NSBE will also be able to mark a record of the years the competitions took place.

4. Learning Experience for Mentors – The overall learning experience expressed by the mentors is, "PATIENCE." They learned that every child does not think the same and at times will test you to see how you will be as a disciplinarian. Mentors suggested that the Lead Mentor(s) be left without a group. This way they would be available to provide assistance with individual students who may

need special attention. They would also then act as a monitor of the all the groups in the classroom.

5. Keeping the Kids Alert – There were a lot of complaints about the students being bored and the days being too long which the mentors feel attributed to some of the students acting out. They were restless. They attempted to implement games such as Simon Says or Hang Man using the vocabulary from the lessons. Some students enjoyed this, but it only held their attention for a short period of time.

During the mentor training, there was an emphasis on creating affirmative development environments. Affirmative development environments are those wherein each stakeholder knows that

- Their value to family, school and community is affirmed;
- Their talents, skills and potential are affirmed;
- An expectation of success is affirmed;
- Processes and procedures are put in place to encourage, develop and support their positive sense of self, their community, talents, value and success; and
- Safety nets are created to affirm a positive environment so that even when one fails at reaching a goal, one will still have the courage and support to try again.

In addition to their comments about their weeks' experiences, mentors were asked to complete a form which listed affirmative development indicators to assess whether or not such environments were being actualized in the Seek program. Unfortunately, consistent data were not available for all three weeks. There were far fewer respondents for weeks two and three than for week one. This is due to an administrative issue at WHQ. Mentor reflection forms were to be completed, transmitted, and stored electronically. However, a substantial number of the respondents' forms were not completed or lost during this process. The total number of forms obtained were 50, 16, and 17 for weeks one, two, and three respectively. Table 8 reports the overall mean responses across all three weeks. A mean score of five reflected that mentors thought this variable (or classroom descriptor) occurs all of the time. Conversely, a mean score of one would mean that it did not occur at all. Based on these data, mentors did indeed feel that an affirmative development environment was created. They perceived a positive atmosphere most of the time and an environment where student opinions were valued and high expectations were held. Classroom strategies were also affirming as cooperation, application of knowledge, and instruction which focused on understanding were present. As one reviews the listing of classroom environment indicators, the only one which received a mean score of three (i.e., sometimes) was instruction focused on memorization. All other indicators received mean scores above three. The frequency of responses for each week is delineated in Attachment II.

Table 8
Mentor Feedback Re: Classroom Environment

	Week1 N	Week 2 N	Week 3 N	Overall Mean*
1. Students opinions are valued	50	16	17	4.41
2. High expectations are held for students	50	16	17	4.29
3. Students held high expectations for themselves	49	16	17	3.53
4. Sense of community prevailed in group	48	16	17	3.61
5. Program instructional time managed effectively	49	16	17	3.92
6. Positive atmosphere in classroom	49	16	17	3.97
7. Students paid attention	50	16	17	3.55
8. Students were positively engaged	49	16	17	3.80
9. Students were motivated	49	16	17	3.85
10. Multiple teaching methods were used	50	16	17	4.25
11. Instruction focused on understanding	50	16	17	4.39
12. Instruction focused on memorization	49	16	17	3.00
13. Mentor was effective in teaching lesson	50	16	17	4.15
14. Mentor made efforts to build on students' assets	50	16	17	4.48
15. Mentor made efforts to build on students' interests	50	16	17	4.32
16. Competition was emphasized	50	16	17	4.24
17. Cooperation was emphasized	50	16	17	4.15
18. Application of knowledge was emphasized	50	16	17	4.48
19. Concepts/themes were connected across activities	50	16	17	4.32
20. Mentor observed positive differences in group	50	16	17	4.24

*5 = All the time 4 = Most of the time 3 = Sometimes 2 = Not Often 1 = Not at all

Mentors' Evaluation of Overall Program

The evaluation team only received fourteen of the fifty-four mentor evaluations for the overall program. This represents only 25.9% of the mentors. The data presented in this section, including Table 9, are reported for this sample alone. These data may or may not be representative of the full sample. However, based on the training data from the mentors, their voices were fairly consistent. The mentors felt that the pre-training was effective, both the educational information and the project based training. This entire sample agreed that they learned valuable new information. All but one of this sample agreed that the program was well organized. Regarding their students interaction with the program, a listing of the sample's responses is presented in Table 11.

Table 9
Mentors Feedback on Student Activities/Participation

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students gained valuable experiences	8	57.1	6	42.0	0	0	0	0
Project materials engaged the students	5	35.7	9	64.3	0	0	0	0
I developed a mentor relationship with students	10	71.4	4	28.6	0	0	0	0
Students were exposed to engineering	10	71.4	4	28.6	0	0	0	0
Students had fun	6	42.9	8	57.1	0	0	0	0
The pace of the program was positive	7	50.0	4	28.6	2	14.3	0	0
The daily program schedule was effective	2	14.3	9	64.3	2	14.3	0	0
Students were actively engaged	7	50	4	28.6	2	14.3	0	0
Field trips enhanced the program	0	0	3	21.4	3	21.4	(8 w/no response)	

The sample mentors generally provide a very positive assessment of SEEK. They agreed that the students were exposed to engineering, and gained valuable experiences and that the program met its goals and objectives. A couple felt that the daily schedule could have been better as well as the field trips. However, the objective of the SEEK program was met according to this sample.

When asked to specify what they thought the students got out of the program, mentors indicated that students received a lot of valuable information and exposure, plus they gained a more positive sense of self:

- They had a much better knowledge directly and gained much more confidence
- They learned how to build a skimmer. They also learned critical thinking and problem solving.
- They learned to work together as a group. They also learned to see themselves as a positive and smart individual.
- Students have an ideal of what engineering is all about; and also the different types of engineering departments they can choose as a career.

Mentors liked the fact that they were able to work with the students in such small groups and thus were able to bond with them. They also appreciated the structure of the program and the direction they received in training. Mentors really enjoyed the presentations and the competitions. They felt that they were actually witnessing the 'fruits of their labor' as their children participated on Fridays. On the other hand, mentors felt that the organization could have been more 'sharp'; that there were issues regarding time which could have been

handled better administratively. Some felt that they didn't get enough training or support with dealing with children who exhibited problem behavior.

The data included in this report are self reported, thus, there may be a tendency to be less objective about issues that could cast a negative light on the mentor role. There were a couple of experienced teachers who also served as mentors for the program. They were involved in the day-to-day operation. One of these teachers is also an advisor for an exemplar PCI/NSBE Jr. program. We asked her to pay special attention to the operational aspects of the program so that she would be able to provide a teacher's perspective. She felt that the program was wonderful and a very positive experience for all of the participating students. However, she did note some issues which could possibly be improved for future SEEK programs. What follows is her response to how the program could be improved:

Nutrition should be part of this program. Everybody needs a balanced diet. The day is too long. The camp should be no longer than the normal school day. If you want to keep the students until 5:00, then there should be an after school program with another set of mentors coming in from 3-5 to take care of those students. The focus could be health and nutrition.

The mentor teams need a common planning time to talk and plan for each day. There was no time built in the schedule for this. I also feel that students should dress professionally each day. This is a professional job and should be treated that way. Children will give you a lot more respect if you dress the part. I have a high respect for NSBE. We need to respect ourselves. We are supposed to be modeling for our children. We had some wonderful people here. I learned a lot from many and saw a lot of good things and excellent relationships with the children.

Sleeping in the teacher's lounge and in the classroom is unacceptable. Taking hourly breaks and spending time watching TV during working time is not part of the contract. It takes a lot of energy to work with children. You cannot stay up all night and expect to be at your best for these children. Not showing up for the job and missing the bus is also unacceptable.

It would have been nice to have a nice official NSBE sign welcoming the people here at Howard outside and in the lobby and a familiar NSBE person in the lobby. We needed people to help with luggage and directions as to where we were suppose to go. It would have been helpful if signs had been put in the hallways directing us or people to show us when we arrived. By the time I arrived (mid afternoon), the people were giving you an abundance of instructions and trying to see how fast they could say them. Also, it would be nice to have some refreshments (water) available when we arrive. It was extremely hot, and we had been traveling all day. We needed a packet, something or someone to tell us where to find food.

There should also be more money for experienced teachers.

Summary and Recommendations

Based on reports by students and mentors, the SEEK program was very successful. Students were definitely exposed to STEM concepts and had the opportunity to have daily engaging hands-on activities in engineering design.

Their parents reported that over half of their children did not know what engineers do prior to the program. Now, each of the students was able to become engineers for a few short weeks. The hands-on aspect of the program coupled with the small student-to-mentor ratio allowed each student to fully participate in the work. Students were able to observe first-hand role models of other African Americans in college, coming back to the community, and involved in the STEM areas. The SAE materials were engaging (to both the students and the mentors) and provided the students an opportunity to be successful in an area that they had little previous knowledge or understanding.

Parents were also very supportive of the program. Some wrote letters after the program thanking NSBE for SEEK and wanting to know how they could help to continue the momentum begun by their child's participation in SEEK. The parents were not, on average, low-income. With an average income of over sixty thousand dollars per household with two or three children, they were middle class. Many of those who were able came out on Fridays to observe the presentations and competitions. NSBE has generated a strong parent base to support future activities with this age group of students. The successful partnership with SAE also opened the door for continued collaboration,

This was a pilot program and there are a variety of issues that need to be reworked or revised. In the previous section, mentors shared some of their suggestions for improvement. Based on their input and the issues raised by the data used in this report, the following recommendations are offered for consideration:

- 1. Provide Mentors with all the necessary materials, both content and operational, prior to the training; greater emphasis on mentor roles and expectations;**
- 2. Have evaluations created at the onset of the program in order for the data to be sent directly to NSBE upon completion; emphasize accountability;**
- 3. Systems should be put into place for accurate student attendance and record keeping;**
- 4. Incorporate a student profile to be completed by the parent as part of the application process (including whether the child has special needs);**
- 5. If students are added after the program begins, develop a way to bring them up to speed without interfering with the progress of students who have been in attendance;**
- 6. Incorporate incentives for consistent attendance of students and consequences for missing classes (this should be done for mentors as well);**
- 7. Have mentor leaders in each classroom to be responsible for record keeping, getting evaluations, assisting students with special needs, communication across groups, and follow up, etc. for the classroom each week. This leader should be paid an additional stipend;**
- 8. If the program continues to operate as a full day (until 5:00 pm) provide an after-school program which allows students to be more athletic/artistic and engage in activities different from the school day activities. This may require a different staff but can have a higher student-to-staff ratio;**
- 9. Develop a prize system to be explained and anticipated by students.**
- 10. Follow through with all promises made to students and mentors;**

- 11. Provide a time each day for mentors to work together, share notes about their students and plan for the day;**
- 12. Provide mechanisms for parent involvement;**
- 13. Provide mechanisms for follow-up with students to sustain their interest in STEM areas;**
- 14. Greater outreach efforts to children from lower-income families.**

Creating, coordinating and implementing a new program for a target population with which NSBE has had little experience, was quite an enormous venture. Based on these data, students and mentors both gained from their experiences with the program. The goal of exposing the target students to STEM areas and engineering particularly was met by all accounts. This was done through the collaboration with SAE and using the hands on materials they provided. There were issues which arose that can be addressed and lessons learned which can all be incorporated with careful planning for the next SEEK program. From the mentors accounts the SEEK program did help fulfill NSBE's mission to increase the number of culturally responsible black engineers who excel academically, succeed professionally and positively impact the community. This can be seen by the dedication of many of the mentors who were positively impacting their community. Whether or not the young students who participated in the SEEK program continue to follow the lead of their mentors remains to be seen. Follow-up to support these young 3rd through 5th graders as they continue in school will be an important factor.

Attachment I

This data set represents the responses of 67 mentors who completed and turned in their evaluation forms. Three students are not included in the first four tables because they did not circle whether they participated in the skimmer, tin can or jet toy training. Their open ended responses are included however. The first two tables report the percentages of the overall/total data set. Tables 3 – 8 report the data segregated by the category of SAE training. Total percentages will be between 99 and 101 as they were rounded up at .5 and over and rounded

We would like your feedback on our training so that we can improve in the future. Your feedback really counts, so please let us know if you agree or disagree with the following statements about the overall training	Agree	Disagree	Not applicable/ No Answer
Total N = 64	%	%	%
1. The information presented was helpful.	100	0	0
2. I learned valuable new information.	97	2	2
3. I actively participated in the workshops.	95	2	4
4. The presenters were engaging.	98	0	2
5. The materials used were helpful and useful.	100	0	0
6. The level of the workshops was just right for me.	92	5	3
7. The pace of the workshop was good.	77	23	0
8. The workshops were well organized.	84	13	3

down below .5. Table 1 – Overall workshop ratings

We also would like your assessment of the specific sessions of the SEEK training. Total N = 64	Excel- lent %	Good %	OK %	Poor %	Very Poor %	Did not attend %
9. The MEES Friday morning session	61	25	11	0	0	3
10. The School Walk Thru	31	44	23	0	0	2
11. The classroom strategies Friday afternoon session	42	36	19	0	0	3
12. The informal group session (I'm a little teapot)	34	41	20	0	2	3
13. The SAE training - Saturday	58	33	9	0	0	0
14. The SAE training - Sunday	48	38	11	3	0	0
15. The mentor session – Sunday afternoon	28	42	23	5	0	2
16. Rate overall training	36	53	11	0	0	0

Table 2 – Overall ratings of specific sessions

Table 3 – Workshop ratings from mentors being trained as 'skimmer' experts

We would like your feedback on our training so that we can improve in the future. Your feedback really counts, so please let us know if you agree or disagree with the following statements about the overall training	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable or No Answer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. The information presented was helpful.	20	100				
2. I learned valuable new information.	19	95	1	5		
3. I actively participated in the workshops.	20	100				
4. The presenters were engaging.	20	100				
5. The materials used were helpful and useful.	20	100				
6. The level of the workshops was just right for me.	20	100				
7. The pace of the workshop was good.	17	85	3	15		
8. The workshops were well organized.	18	90	2	10		

We would like your feedback on our training so that we can improve in the future. Your feedback really counts, so please let us know if you agree or disagree with the following statements about the overall training	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable or No Answer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. The information presented was helpful.	22	100				
2. I learned valuable new information.	21	95			1	5
3. I actively participated in the workshops.	21	95	1	5		
4. The presenters were engaging.	22	100				
5. The materials used were helpful and useful.	22	100				
6. The level of the workshops was just right for me.	20	91	2	9		
7. The pace of the workshop was good.	18	82	4	18		
8. The workshops were well organized.	19	86	2	9	1	5

Table 4 – Workshop ratings from mentors being trained as 'steel can' experts

We would like your feedback on our training so that we can improve in the future. Your feedback really counts, so please let us know if you agree or disagree with the following statements about the overall training	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable or No Answer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. The information presented was helpful.	22	100				
2. I learned valuable new information.	22	100				
3. I actively participated in the workshops.	20	91	1	5	1	5
4. The presenters were engaging.	21	95			1	5
5. The materials used were helpful and useful.	22	100				
6. The level of the workshops was just right for me.	19	86	1	5	2	9
7. The pace of the workshop was good.	14	64	8	36	1	18
8. The workshops were well organized.	17	77	4	18	1	5

Table 5 – Workshop ratings from mentors being trained as 'jet toy' experts

We also would like your assessment of the specific sessions of the SEEK training.	Excellent		Good		OK		Poor		Very Poor	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. The MEES Friday morning session	14	70	4	20	2	10				
10. The School Walk Thru	7	35	8	40	5	25				
11. The classroom strategies Friday afternoon session	9	45	7	35	4	20				
12. The informal group session (I'm a little teapot)	8	40	7	35	5	25				
13. The SAE training - Saturday	12	60	7	35	1	5				
14. The SAE training - Sunday	12	60	7	35	1	5				
15. The mentor session – Sunday afternoon	8	40	6	30	5	25	1	5		
16. Rate overall training	8	80	9	45	3	15				

Table 6 – Specific workshop ratings of mentors being trained as 'skimmer' experts

We also would like your assessment of the specific sessions of the SEEK training.	Excellent		Good		OK		Poor		Very Poor		Did not attend	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. The MEES Friday morning session	11	50	7	32	2	9					2	9
10. The School Walk Thru	5	23	12	55	4	18					1	5
11. The classroom strategies Friday afternoon session	8	36	8	36	4	18					2	9
12. The informal group session (I'm a little teapot)	7	32	6	27	7	32			1	5	1	5
13. The SAE training - Saturday	12	55	6	27	4	18						
14. The SAE training - Sunday	10	45	6	27	6	27						
15. The mentor session – Sunday afternoon	5	23	10	45	6	27					1	5
16. Rate overall training	4	18	16	73	2	9						

Table 7 – Specific workshop ratings of mentors being trained as 'steel can' experts

We also would like your assessment of the specific sessions of the SEEK training.	Excellent		Good		OK		Poor		Very Poor		Did not attend	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. The MEES Friday morning session	14	64	5	23	3	14						
10. The School Walk Thru	8	36	8	36	6	27						
11. The classroom strategies Friday afternoon session	10	45	8	36	4	18						
12. The informal group session (I'm a little teapot)	7	32	13	59	1	5					1	5
13. The SAE training - Saturday	13	59	8	36	1	5						
14. The SAE training - Sunday	9	41	11	50			2	9				
15. The mentor session - Sunday afternoon	5	23	11	50	4	18	2	9				
16. Rate overall training	11	50	9	41	2	9						

Table 8 – Specific workshop ratings of mentors being trained as 'jet toy' experts
In addition to the data generated by the forced choice questions in Tables 1 – 8, mentors answered four open ended questions:

- What did you like most about the training?
 - What did you like least about the training?
 - Realistically, what would you do to make the SEEK training sessions better?
 - If there is anything else you'd like to share with us about the SEEK training.
- Thank you so much for your input and commitment to the future generation of NSBE members!

The responses to these questions are listed below. This is not an analysis of these data, merely a record of what mentors wrote.

17. What did you like most about the training?

- The projects – the skimmer training.
- The Presenters were enthusiastic about presenting the material and very knowledgeable.
- Very interactive.
- Dr. Carroll's lecture on race.
- Everything...all grounds were covered, not just the building aspect.
- The icebreaker activities really engaged the mentors and aided in absorbing new information.

- A lot of information was presented and it was done well. NSBE leadership is amazing.
- The presenter/facilitator was knowledgeable and engaged the students in the learning process. Also, our assistant was able to be with us throughout the day; the entire NSBE staff.
- I liked having the hands on and actually working through what the students will be doing; building the model, testing, evaluating and scoring.
- Workshops.
- I liked being at HQ. I really liked the MEES presentation and the bonding with other mentors. I really liked participating in making the skimmers.
- Interactive sessions, hands on experience, group training with mentors.
- The skimmer building.
- I like the ideas and the purpose of the camp. Also, I enjoyed learning more about NSBE.
- How interactive and engaging the trainers were.
- The training was really detailed and important for our success as mentors.
- What I liked most about the training was I stayed busy, interested, and are good.
- Meeting and getting to know the other mentors.
- Just how well the amount of information was presented in such a short amount of time.
- Ms. Grace Carroll was very organized and presented information that was helpful.
- The coming together as a group.
- Got me involved in more thinking and apply knowledge.
- The training was fitting for the - preparing for the coming days.
- It's informative.
- Hands on.
- I learned new information and I was able to grasp all the new concepts that were taught easily.
- The information was adequately passed on to us. There was interaction between every mentor in one way or the other.
- I really enjoyed the different projects that we did (steel can rover).
- I like the fact that I'm improving my knowledge on how to help out the youth of today. The adults of tomorrow. I like the fact that we are pilot; that'll way if I was to help with an idea it may stick.
- I really enjoyed the engineering of the steel can rover.
- Helped me to open my mind to new ideas and apply them to the project at hand it also gave me hands on experience.
- That we got valuable information on things I never knew. I liked fact it was excellent. NSBE takes great care of their mentors. I like the idea of us trying to help kids with the future.
- Helped me to open my mind to new ideas and apply them to the project sat hand it also gave me hands on experience.

- I was comfortable with everybody; the people made us eager to meet the children. The food.
- I liked the fact that it gave me a chance to add and apply skills that I've learned in previous training sessions.
- I liked the fact that we were very much engaged in the presentations of being a good mentor/teacher. The information learned should be invaluable for the week. Definitely made me feel more prepared.
- I liked every hands-on activity that not only got the mentors involved, but also prepared us for the upcoming weeks. I also enjoyed the informal group session.
- This is an exciting experience and NSBE interaction works well.
- I like the interaction of the mentors and the important information that Mrs. Grace Carroll conveyed. The collaboration of teams made training very engaging as well.
- The things that were being explained and taught were very helpful for starting this program. It helped us to get prepared for the upcoming SEEK program. Some of the subjects can be also helpful in everyday life.
- It was more than engaging on the level of group interaction.
- The information that was presented was very helpful in understanding the purposes and expectations from this camp.
- The projects were simply fantastic. It would go a long way to teach, entertain and motivate the kids.
- I like how the leaders explained what SEEK was all about. I like the energy that Tarence showed through out the training.
- The information on mentoring was what I liked the most. I felt the MEES Friday morning session was very informative and gave me a good background and sense of purpose with regards to my role in the SEEK program.
- I really enjoyed the group activities and also the classroom management course.
- The animal game. It was fun. I loveeeeeeeeeeeeeeeee it.
- Doing the activities allowed the mentors to see exactly what problems the kids would have and how to help them.
- Getting to know new people and working on the Jet Toy project.
- This experience allowed me to learn better interaction with the children. This taught me new roles I can play in my community.
- Grace Carroll's lectures; Sunday competition.
- That the level of enthusiasm from our leaders; they set the stage for us to be completely involved in the...process and know the really...we are doing.
- I really enjoyed the MEES training. I think that is information that we all need to know not only for being a SEEK mentor, but in everyday life.
- Teacher training skills gained.
- I enjoyed the SAE training because we were activity involved.
- It was a very informative and motivational. The pace was very consistent and helpful to those who have not been around children.

- Hands-on activity.
- Learning all the mentor info. Also, learning the lessons hands-on.
- Dr. Grace offered a lot of knowledge. Matt was knowledgeable in Jet Toy presentation.
- The presentations.
- Interactions; Dr. Carroll; SAE.
- The SAE presenters. I enjoyed my activity and the trainer was engaging. I feel well equipped to teach children.
- The mentoring, food, the people attending, the staff, etc.
- Competitions were very helpful in reconnecting to the days when we were that age and remembering/experiencing the moments that they will feel when they participate in the projects.
- The refreshment of the information from Ms. Grace Carroll, I loved the way she presented; I learned how to make different types of skimmers; meeting a lot of new people from other states the Bonding and team work friendliness; the helpfulness and support from the NSBE staff.
- I liked the link between the mentoring of students and their education. "Love is not enough."
- That we get valuable information on things I never knew. I liked the food it was excellent. NSBE takes great care of their mentors. I like the idea of us having to help kids.
- The closeness and friendliness between the SEEK mentors as well as the staff. Also, Dr. Grace sessions were informative and great. Food [lunch] was great.

18. What did you like least about the training?

- The little spacing time for the various meals.
- Undecided.
- Too short.
- That it lasted so very long. Overall it was very good and I don't think we wasted time on invaluable information.
- The long days prevented active listening at the end of the day.
- Inconsistency with time.
- We ended early two days in row and went long on Sunday.
- The capacity level of people was maxed out and this resulted in being over crowded at time. Lunch & dinner well planned but breakfast should have been planned better.
- There is nothing I liked least about the program. I feel like everything we did was necessary so that we can do a good job.
- Training on the weekends for such a long period of time.
- Extremely long hours 7am – 7pm.
- Long session.
- We needed a break or a half day before jumping into training.
- Length and heat in rooms.
- The time, it was too long.

- We stayed past the time we were supposed to leave.
- The repetition & mentors not reading material & asking questions about things they should have known.
- Nothing I enjoyed it all.
- I had to stay in one room for all of training so it wasn't the ideal place to be.
- Time management.
- Should be a little spaced out.
- Respectively it was on weekends, which was church.
- The fact that the facilitators don't keep to time.
- Hours of running. Transportation.
- Timing – I couldn't go to church on Sunday.
- Besides the heat going off on the last day. The training was excellent.
- The duration of the training each day.
- I liked least the fact that I didn't get to much sleep but I'll be okay because I feel like a "Rock star". Oh yeah, crowded lunch ☺ but at least God Bless us with food – can't complaint.
- The hours but you can't help that with the short amount of time we get.
- That it was crammed into three days.
- Nothing really everything was valuable. Except that the schedule sometimes wasn't accurate but it was mostly today.
- That it was crammed into three days.
- There was a lot of information for just a little time. [training]
- The duration.
- I think it could have been a better/larger setting. The pace was a little too fast for some

- Basically the long hours; nothing else bothered me too much.
- I did not like that the information, usually taught over a period of weeks, had to be crammed over a few days. It not only made days longer and nights shorter, but I also, every now and then, felt I would forget the valuable information I learned within those few hours.
- For a pilot the information and delivery was good. More information needs to be handed out during the beginning.
- The least thing about the training is some participation and the organization of the Lead Mentors.
- There was a lot of “down town” in regards to transitioning from arrival at WTTQ the beginning of the session.
- The scheduling could be improved.
- The limited allocated to the training session made it more rigorous and demanding.
- Some of the days was a little long, especially when someone is lecturing all day; the space we had the training; I think the room should have been bigger.
- The scheduling of the training sessions was what I liked the best. Friday's session was shorter than both the last two days, but yet we are expected to be up and ready to go at 6:30 for the 1st day.
- The training was organized, but timing was very unprofessional. We understand that this is a pilot, but NSBE can do so much better because I know we can. Better timing and planning is my request.
- Length. It's too long. I got exhausted at the end and couldn't focus.
- The way breakfast was served – I think there should be only cold breakfast options to speed up the process.
- Nothing but did get frustrated while working on project.
- The heat and the time length.
- Sunday afternoon's session was pretty much chaos.
- The time issue we had to rush into a lot of the training time and didn't get the full point process.
- Long days.
- Grueling hours.
- The time sessions of each lecture.
- Sometimes peoples' personalities would clash in a negative way and it would sometimes get to an out of control situation.
- Long hours.
- The length but it was needed to get everything done.
- Hot rooms.
- The room temperature.
- Some sessions were very long.
- The schedule!!! I felt everything throughout the training was very good and informative, but I think that there was too much information and activities to conduct over such a small amount of time. I suggest for the future that training should be considered going on at least for one week.

- Nothing.
- SAE long winded should highlight key points more on. Teaching material as if we were 3rd, 4th and 5th graders was a little EXTREME but may have helped those that were less experienced in working with youth but bored the others.
- The long hours and late nights, then up in the morning early the next day; when the air condition when out and it was extremely hot☺.

19. Realistically, what would you do to make the SEEK training sessions better?

- More training days and less information taught in a day. This, I think, would prevent fatigue.
- There should be a day of rest between the end of training and the first day of the camp.
- Because it's a pilot program, realistically there is nothing that I could have done to make sessions better.
- Divide the training into one more day. The training was very useful and necessary; I do wish we could have had more time to play with our toys in order to make them work better.
- Better organization, but this is the pilot year therefore errors are expected.
- Provide actual breaks during the day and include a rest day between training and the first day of camp.
- Be a mentor next year.
- More groups sectioned off and a rotating cycle would have been nice with different presenters but same information from not only consultants but real teachers who had did these projects in the class.
- I would like to complete the training and then have a day to sit down and go through everything and prepare for the first day. Training should be done at a larger facility. You need more experienced teachers for these children.
- Spread out the time range over maybe a week's time range.
- Time management.
- Spread training over more days with fewer hours.
- Better activity timing i.e. lesser meeting over a period of time.
- I think the kinks will work themselves out. Next year, you will be able to tell from experience and know what works and what will not.
- Overall, the training sessions were great.
- Be very optimistic and engage in team work organization.
- Have more ice breakers.
- Start them earlier and give a day off before the camp starts.
- Change the eating schedule and more breaks.
- Have different people come and talk; print out slides so we can follow along; tell more people about the realistic behaviors of kids this age.
- Shorten it to maintain focus.
- To give feed back on this camp experience after the 3 weeks which will help know which areas need improvements.

- I would involve more speakers.
- Improve more on timing and also introduce new ideas.
- I would spread it over a longer time – frame, but I understand that it's the pilot and it's in the experimental phase.
- Lesser hours because we were exhausted at the end of each day.
- Hold training in a suitable size room...
- Every year it will get better that's a given but I'll state the thing that I know what will improve; it was organized well I thought but there was lots' of people; maybe move space. I'd also like the training sessions to be maybe 1 day longer. So when I come back next year, I'll get more sleep. I'd also like to see more than 75 in training in order to reach more people.
- Extend the training so the hours aren't so long next year.
- Training could possibly be a bit shorter. No one has really slept well, and some seem irritable (to no fault of their own). We want the most alert and brightest teachers in the front of our children.
- There was a lot of information for just a little time. [Training]
- Spread them out over a longer period of time so that everything is absorbed.
- I guess better organization with group and discussions that all take place should match presentation.
- Spread them out over a longer period of time so that everything is absorbed.
- The training should be for one week and not three days.
- Schedule the training days to an appropriate time.
- I would have put rockets on the side of the binder for handouts. I think it would have been better in a different facility. Maybe it would be more effective if training was done at a much slower pace and for not as long during the day.
- Increase the days in which the mentors would possibly have at least an entire week of training. So that the hours could be shortened for each day.
- I would possibly make the training session longer than three days so that the speaker would not have to rush through the presentation. I would make sure every session started on time (the reason I disagreed with the organization of the workshop) with or without all of the mentors and give strict guidelines concerning the actions of the mentors as well as consequences if for instance the member doesn't show up on time or at a session at all.
- Add an online training session to be completed. It could cover the NSBE history, PCI Program and reading material of SAE. All program mentors should become certified to deliver local SEEK programs in the future.
- I would make the SEEK training more engaging by having people participate more to keep them alert and also have a separate training (one hour/one ½ hour) for Lead Mentors to get more acquainted with each other.

- Same as stated as above for question 18. That it was very informative and useful. Just for future references consider extending training sessions for maybe a week.
- Not cram so much information into one day. Have training last over a course of a week, maybe, so that all information is taken seriously.
- Expand the training to about five days so more information could be retained.
- I will definitely be dedicated, determined and creative all through the program to contribute to the success of this NSBE pioneer initiative.
- I would make it a little shorter or add an extra day to shorten the other days; I would like the speaker to be more interactive to keep the other students active in listening.
- Better organization of food allocation since a lot of time was mismanaged and wasted waiting on food and long eating periods. Since there is a lot of training material to cover in a short time, more info should be packed in Friday and Saturday with the students work day on the final day of training.
- Rather than cram information into a weekend, let's strive for more realistic timing for the training. Work on energizers throughout the day to keep people excited.
- More training days for shorter training sessions since, we're most active in the morning. We were fed at really close intervals I get freaking hungry late evening.
- Show videos from previous SEEK camps (because this was the first camp, this was not an option but it could be useful in the future).
- Stretch the training process out; make it more than three days.
- Time consistency.
- Get more NSBE advisor [example, Terrance Frank] to help train mentors.
- The time set a more time for training in case we have problems with anything; we don't have much through the other points.
- I really thought the training was great. The only thing I would change if it would be possible is spreading the having all for a full week.
- Although I know information was compacted too much in long hours becomes ineffective and will loose the more engaging audience. Some parts of training should be identified for personal reading.
- Better organization.
- The only thing that I would change is the amount of time given to train.
- Air conditioning. End early since we need to get sleep.
- Better housing.
- More organized and more spacious.
- Larger room; however the room was really nice! It is a lot of information and three days may not be enough time.
- Allow more time for training so everything isn't stuffed.
- Expand the program.

- Make training a week long rather than cram everything into one weekend. Make sessions shorter. If you cram you get out what you put in cramming during the week practice how you expect program to run.
- I think that we need a day of rest after training before we actually start the seek camp. I also think we need longing time for training so the days will not be so long and late.

20. If there is anything else you'd like to share with us about the SEEK training. Thank you so much for your input and commitment to the future generation of NSBE members!

- The training days were too long.
 - There's always room for improvement. Things could be better organized according to materials, teams, agendas and how it's structured. But I understand it was the 1st one.
 - GREAT JOB NSBE!
 - To consider a bigger training center with different seminar sessions to choose from for different days and different groups preferably at the Housing Campus. Metro was stressful and many had to stand on the bus for at least 30 minutes the first day.
-
- I think this will be very successful and very much needed. I believe in this and looking forward to the continuing of this program. I think it is important to have a qualified teacher in the classroom.
 - I have had a lot of fun. I feel I learned very valuable skills.
 - Thanks a lot for allowing me the ability to enlighten the minds of young black people.
 - Generally the training was helpful but I think the accommodations could have been better.
 - Actually, I would be interested in coming back in the future (from what I've seen so far).
 - Should be spaced out i.e. training should be for about five days.
 - This is a great project and I look forward seeing more of it.
 - NSBE is great I love what you're doing. Even though I come to teach I've learned something from all ya'll. I need to take it to the next level. Initially...Engineering is something I'm good at but now, it's more than ME. It needs to be done for them the ADULTS OF TOMORROW. So, if you could tell Brother Ed to stay in office maybe 10yrs. I'll take over when he's done. ☺
 - The dorms are hot with mosquitoes! Ouch!
 - Making the mentors have insufficient sleep is bad for the program.
 - It's a great program which I could change the future...of black children if it kept up with information level now. Hopefully it will go far and brings things program to places never expected.
 - Making the mentors have insufficient sleep is bad for the program.

- Sky's the limit! I appreciate everything NSBE is doing for me; the food, dorm, transportation etc. I am really going to try my best with the children. Thank you.
- I feel that the shirts should be given to us prior to the first day of the program. The feeling of being even prepared by that amount would definitely help feel prepared ourselves for that first day.
- Overall, there is much to learn from this pilot program and it'll get better and better every year, but I have really enjoyed and do appreciate my NSBE family.
- All the end of the program. Thank everyone for their hard work and vision.
- I think that the Lead Mentor would be more useful if they just interacted with the other mentor groups in the classroom. The Lead Mentor needs to be alert and aware of all surroundings.
- I am personally honored, grateful, and feel very privileged to be participating in the NSBE SEEK program.
- My biggest issue is that none of the Regional PCI chairs are here. I really appreciate the opportunity to train at wonderful WHQ, and meet the people who work behind the scenes to run and operation the organization. I love you guys!!
- The training could focus more on the teaching side of the materials that will be taught to the kids.
- I think it would have been a great ideal if we could have had a day of rest before the camp so our body could rest; I think more of the training should have been at the school so we can get a feel of the school.
- Dr. Carroll's presentation was very informative but at the same time it was A LOT of information. I believe it would be good if we were able to take a more active role in participation such as slides which had blanks in that it so that we could record key points as they were being pointed out. I find that strategy helps me remember well.
- I think it would be a good idea to have more interaction with the school set-up during training besides that quick overview of that we received. Some of the SAE training could be carried out at the school.
- Overall, the planning and logistics can be better. With the magnitude of this program, let's be real and provide more WHQ staff to be here. I applaud Franklin, Tarence, LaShonda, Angela, Arrlaya, and everyone else that was here everyday of training. I also applaud the NEB and REB members that came to freely "serve the membership". Again, I enjoyed everything so far and I expect to see greater things.
- Well it will be good to have it every summer and develop it across the whole country and it possible outside. I was happy to see NSBE has branches in Africa notably my country GHANA. It would be good to extend it to African students too. Education there is too theoretical and complete rote learning.
- If SEEK is successful and more camps open, the advertising for the camp should be greatly increased. Other than that everything was great.
- Just the length of the training sessions, does not allow strength for the next day.

- Thanks for selected me to be a part of this camp; I'm learning a lot; I hope to return next year.
- It was hot.
- Excellent experience so far and I am impressed with the quality and efficiency for the 1st time.
- Project has great goal and potential; I'm looking forward to Monday.
- The people who are running and helping SEEK are doing a very good job and should keep it up.
- I love NSBE!
- Great training!
- Determine how May vegetarian and dieting ready people are in the group so there isn't a big hassle over food.
- Keep it up because NSBE is doing a great job.
- You should @ the end of the charter see how many would be willing to recruit during the year, FRC, RLC, SCC, etc. and then see how many would come back and train next year for our new mentors as well as have the kids go to conference and conventions.

Table A
Week 1 – Mentor Feedback Re: Classroom Environment

	All the time		Most of the time		Sometimes		Not Often		Not at all	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Students opinions are valued	24	48.0	24	48.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2. High expectations are held for students	23	46.0	16	32.0	10	20.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
3. Students held high expectations for themselves	3	6.0	22	44.0	21	42.0	3	6.0	0	0.0
4. Sense of community prevailed in group	9	18.0	15	30.0	18	36.0	6	12.0	0	0.0
5. Program instructional time managed effectively	10	20.0	25	50.0	12	24.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
6. Positive atmosphere in classroom	16	32.0	23	46.0	10	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7. Students paid attention	3	6.0	26	52.0	17	34.0	4	8.0	0	0.0
8. Students were positively engaged	8	16.0	29	58.0	11	22.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
9. Students were motivated	10	20.0	26	52.0	12	24.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
10. Multiple teaching methods were used	23	46.0	17	34.0	8	16.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
11. Instruction focused on understanding	24	48.0	20	40.0	4	8.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
12. Instruction focused on memorization	4	8.0	7	14.0	19	38.0	17	34.0	2	4.0
13. Mentor was effective in teaching lesson	13	26.0	29	58.0	8	16.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
14. Mentor made efforts to build on students' assets	29	58.0	19	38.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
15. Mentor made efforts to build on students' interests	24	48.0	22	44.0	4	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16. Competition was emphasized	25	50.0	14	28.0	9	18.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
17. Cooperation was emphasized	37	74.0	9	18.0	4	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
18. Application of knowledge was emphasized	27	54.0	18	36.0	5	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Concepts/themes were connected across activities	18	36.0	25	50.0	7	14.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
20. Mentor observed positive differences in group	21	42.0	18	36.0	11	22.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table B
Week 2 – Mentor Feedback Re: Classroom Environment

	All the time		Most of the time		Sometimes		Not Often		Not at all	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Students opinions are valued	7	41.2	9	52.9	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
2. High expectations are held for students	10	58.8	6	35.3	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Students held high expectations for themselves	2	11.8	7	41.2	7	41.2	1	5.9	0	0.0
4. Sense of community prevailed in group	3	17.6	6	35.3	7	41.2	1	5.9	0	0.0
5. Program instructional time managed effectively	7	41.2	6	35.3	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
6. Positive atmosphere in classroom	2	11.8	10	58.8	4	23.5	1	5.9	0	0.0
7. Students paid attention	1	5.9	8	47.1	8	47.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
8. Students were positively engaged	3	17.6	6	35.3	7	41.2	1	5.9	0	0.0
9. Students were motivated	2	11.8	10	58.8	5	29.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
10. Multiple teaching methods were used	9	52.9	3	17.6	5	29.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Instruction focused on understanding	11	64.7	5	29.4	1	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
12. Instruction focused on memorization	2	11.8	4	23.5	4	23.5	7	41.2	0	0.0
13. Mentor was effective in teaching lesson	7	41.2	8	47.1	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
14. Mentor made efforts to build on students' assets	7	41.2	8	47.1	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
15. Mentor made efforts to build on students' interests	7	41.2	8	47.1	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
16. Competition was emphasized	4	23.5	10	58.8	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
17. Cooperation was emphasized	15	88.2	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
18. Application of knowledge was emphasized	13	76.5	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Concepts/themes were connected across activities	10	58.8	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
20. Mentor observed positive differences in group	6	35.3	7	41.2	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table C
Week 3 – Mentor Feedback Re: Classroom Environment

	All the time		Most of the time		Sometimes		Not Often		Never	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Students opinions are valued	6	35.3	8	47.1	2	11.8	1	5.9	0	0.0
2. High expectations are held for students	10	58.8	3	17.6	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Students held high expectations for themselves	1	5.9	8	47.1	6	35.3	2	11.8	0	0.0
4. Sense of community prevailed in group	3	17.6	7	41.2	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0.0
5. Program instructional time managed effectively	7	41.2	6	35.3	3	17.6	1	5.9	0	0.0
6. Positive atmosphere in classroom	3	17.6	8	47.1	5	29.4	1	5.9	0	0.0
7. Students paid attention	2	11.8	5	35.3	8	47.1	1	5.9	0	0.0
8. Students were positively engaged	3	17.6	5	29.4	7	41.2	2	11.8	0	0.0
9. Students were motivated	3	17.6	8	47.1	5	29.4	1	5.9	0	0.0
10. Multiple teaching methods were used	9	52.9	4	23.5	3	17.6	1	5.9	0	0.0
11. Instruction focused on understanding	10	58.8	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
12. Instruction focused on memorization	3	17.6	2	11.8	7	41.2	5	29.4	0	0.0
13. Mentor was effective in teaching lesson	6	35.3	8	47.1	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
14. Mentor made efforts to build on students' assets	8	47.1	7	41.2	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
15. Mentor made efforts to build on students' interests	6	35.3	7	41.2	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
16. Competition was emphasized	9	52.9	3	17.6	5	29.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
17. Cooperation was emphasized	13	76.5	2	11.8	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
18. Application of knowledge was emphasized	12	70.6	3	17.6	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Concepts/themes were connected across activities	5	29.4	10	58.8	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
20. Mentor observed positive differences in group	1	5.9	10	58.8	5	29.4	1	5.9	0	0.0