Table 1. Economics for Leaders
Pre-Post Test Results

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Increase
Houston, TX	68%	78%	10%
New Haven, CT (1)	67%	79%	12%
Los Angeles, CA	69%	72%	3%
Berkeley, CA (1)	76%	86%	10%
New Haven, CT (2)	78%	81%	3%
Berkeley, CA (2)	70%	83%	13%
Oberlin, OH	66%	69%	3%
Winston-Salem, NC	76%	85%	9%
Ithaca, NY	71%	82%	11%
Providence, RI	72%	78%	6%
Santa Barbara, CA	72%	75%	3%
Seattle, WA	71%	79%	8%
Ann Arbor, MI	79%	88%	9%
Overall Percent	72%	80%	8%

Table 2. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
463	Participants	3					
Morning	Stimulated Interest	38%	46%	11%	5%	1%	84%
	Clear Content	57%	35%	6%			92%
	Challenging Content	45%	43%	10%	2%		88%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	29%	5%	2%		93%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	42%	38%	14%	5%	1%	81%
	Clear Content	48%	38%	11%	3%	1%	86%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	26%	6%	2%		92%
Overall	Recommend Program	51%	37%	10%	2%	1%	88%
	Improve Understanding	43%	39%	9%	1%		82%

Table 2. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Houston, T	x	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	•				•	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	27%	45%	18%	9%		73%
	Clear Content	42%	48%	9%	575		91%
	Challenging Content	42%	39%	9%	6%	3%	82%
	Responsive Instructors	55%	39%	3%	3%		94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	48%	30%	15%	3%	3%	79%
	Clear Content	36%	39%	15%	6%	3%	76%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	21%	24%	9%		67%
Overall	Recommend Program	52%	27%	18%	3%		79%
	Improve Understanding						0%
New Haver	ı, CT (1)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
37	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	35%	41%	16%	8%		76%
	Clear Content	62%	24%	11%	3%		86%
	Challenging Content	51%	35%	14%			86%
	Responsive Instructors	70%	24%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	35%	38%	14%	8%	5%	73%
	Clear Content	46%	32%	14%	3%	5%	78%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	14%	11%	3%		86%
Overall	Recommend Program	38%	43%	14%	3%	3%	81%
	Improve Understanding	43%	49%	5%	3%		92%
Los Angeles	s. CA	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
_	Participants	_				_	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	32%	48%	13%	6%		81%
	Clear Content	29%	42%	13%	16%		71%
	Challenging Content	26%	39%	26%	10%		65%
	Responsive Instructors	32%	52%	6%	3%	6%	84%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	23%	6%	370	0,0	94%
	Clear Content	74%	19%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%	5/0			100%
Overall	Recommend Program	55%	45%				100%
J.C. u.i.	Improve Understanding	35%	52%	13%			87%

Table 2. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Berkeley, C	(A (1)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
-	Participants	J				J	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	53%	39%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	66%	34%	070			100%
	Challenging Content	55%	37%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	24%	13%	5%		82%
Afternoon	•	50%	37%	5%	8%		87%
71110011	Clear Content	45%	42%	13%	070		87%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	24%	3%	3%		95%
Overall	Recommend Program	63%	29%	5%	3%		92%
Overall	Improve Understanding	53%	42%	5%	3/0		95%
	improve officerstanding	J3/0	42/0	3/0			93/0
		Strongly				Strongly	
Name Harrage	CT (2)	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
New Haven		Agree				Disagree	
	Participants	200/	420/	110/	1.40/	20/	710/
Morning	Stimulated Interest	29%	43%	11%	14%	3%	71%
	Clear Content	31%	51%	14%	3%		83%
	Challenging Content	31%	51%	17%	201		83%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	31%	/	3%		97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	37%	40%	20%	3%		77%
	Clear Content	56%	35%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	69%	23%	6%	3%		91%
Overall	Recommend Program	37%	60%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	31%	49%	20%			80%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Berkeley, C	Δ (2)	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
-	Participants	J				J	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	50%	45%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	74%	24%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	50%	45%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	16%	5%	3%		92%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	18%	34%	29%	18%		53%
Aiteiliooli	Clear Content	16%	45%	18%	21%		61%
	Responsive Instructors	37%	39%	13%	21 <i>%</i> 8%	3%	76%
Overall	Recommend Program	39%	34%	24%	3%	J/0	76% 74%
Overall	Improve Understanding	45%	34% 47%	24% 8%	3/0		92%
	improve onderstanding	4370	4/70	070			34 70

Table 2. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Oberlin, Ol	1	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
-	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	47%	37%	13%	3%		83%
	Clear Content	60%	37%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	53%	43%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	57%	23%	20%			80%
	Clear Content	60%	37%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	20%				100%
	Improve Understanding	60%	37%	3%			97%
Winston-Sa	olom NC	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	Agree				Disagree	
	Stimulated Interest	35%	45%	15%	5%		80%
Morning	Clear Content	33% 70%	45% 25%	3%	3%		95%
	Challenging Content	70 <i>%</i> 50%	30%	20%	3/0		80%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	10%	3%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	40%	45%	13%	3%		96 <i>%</i> 85%
Arternoon	Clear Content	53%	38%	10%	3/0		90%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	25%	3%			98%
Overall	Recommend Program	38%	45%	13%	5%		83%
Overall	Improve Understanding	58%	28%	13%	370	3%	85%
	improve onderstanding		2070	13/0			03/0
Ithaca, NY		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
39	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	33%	54%	13%			87%
	Clear Content	69%	23%	8%			92%
	Challenging Content	46%	51%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	23%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	36%	51%	5%	8%		87%
	Clear Content	44%	41%	13%		3%	85%
	Responsive Instructors	56%	41%		3%		97%
Overall	Recommend Program	51%	36%	10%	3%		87%
	Improve Understanding	46%	41%	10%	3%		87%

Table 2. Economics for Leaders
Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Providence	. RI	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
	Participants					_	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	34%	53%	8%	3%	3%	87%
	Clear Content	61%	37%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	39%	50%	11%			89%
	Responsive Instructors	47%	47%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	37%	39%	21%	3%		76%
	Clear Content	47%	47%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	29%	11%			89%
Overall	Recommend Program	50%	39%	8%		3%	89%
0 10. u	Improve Understanding	34%	50%	13%	3%	373	84%
	6						0 1,70
		Strongly				Strongly	
Santa Barba	ara. CA	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	0					
Morning	Stimulated Interest	34%	45%	8%	13%		79%
	Clear Content	63%	26%	11%	2370		89%
	Challenging Content	42%	42%	13%		3%	84%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	32%	5%		373	95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	34%	47%	16%	3%		82%
7	Clear Content	42%	34%	18%	5%		76%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	29%	5%	373		95%
Overall	Recommend Program	39%	45%	13%	3%		84%
O V C. U.I.	Improve Understanding	42%	39%	18%	370		82%
	miprove onderstanding	12/0	3370	1070			02,0
		Strongly				Strongly	
Seattle, WA	1	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
-	Participants	0					
Morning	Stimulated Interest	29%	58%	10%		3%	87%
	Clear Content	32%	68%			-,-	100%
	Challenging Content	39%	55%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	35%	48%	13%	3%		84%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	45%	42%	13%	0,0		87%
	Clear Content	58%	29%	13%			87%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	13%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	61%	32%	3%		3%	94%
3.0.0	Improve Understanding	45%	52%	3%		370	97%
	prove onderstanding	1370	32/0	370			3170

Table 2. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Ann Arbor,	MI	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
35	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	49%	51%				100%
	Clear Content	65%	32%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	50%	44%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	21%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	53%	38%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	56%	44%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	65%	23%	11%			88%
	Improve Understanding	51%	40%	6%			91%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

	Excep-					
Overall	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
463 Participants						
Economics Team	55%	28%	13%	3%	3%	83%
Leadership Team	54%	26%	13%	5%	5%	80%
Program Coordinators	60%	25%	12%	2%	2%	85%
Residence Halls	19%	30%	34%	12%	3%	49%
Food	14%	22%	35%	20%	7%	37%
Recreational Activities	31%	31%	29%	6%	1%	62%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

	Excep-					
Houston, TX	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
33 Participants						
Economics Team	53%	23%	17%	5%	3%	76%
Leadership Team	67%	27%	2%			94%
Program Coordinators	46%	28%	19%	3%	3%	75%
Residence Halls	27%	52%	18%	3%		79%
Food	3%	6%	39%	30%	21%	9%
Recreational Activities	21%	33%	30%	9%		55%
	Excep-					
New Haven, CT (1)	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
37 Participants		•				
Economics Team	59%	22%	16%	3%		81%
Leadership Team	54%	30%	5%	5%	5%	84%
Program Coordinators	61%	24%	12%	2%		86%
Residence Halls		14%	38%	32%	14%	14%
Food	14%	41%	30%	14%	3%	54%
Recreational Activities	24%	27%	41%	8%		51%
	Excep-					
Los Angeles, CA	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
31 Participants		•				
Economics Team	10%	32%	35%	23%		42%
Leadership Team	39%	32%	23%	6%		71%
Program Coordinators	73%	16%	10%	1%		89%
Residence Halls	16%	35%	45%	3%		52%
Food	29%	35%	26%	6%	3%	65%
Recreational Activities	35%	42%	16%	6%		77%
	Excep-					
Berkeley, CA (1)	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
38 Participants		•				
Economics Team	66%	16%	16%		3%	82%
Leadership Team	63%	24%	13%			87%
Program Coordinators	52%	34%	12%	3%		86%
Residence Halls	5%	34%	39%	16%	5%	39%
Food	8%	13%	42%	24%	13%	21%
Recreational Activities	37%	32%	24%	3%	3%	68%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

	Excep-					
New Haven, CT (2)	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
35 Participants						
Economics Team	34%	40%	17%	6%		74%
Leadership Team	80%	20%				100%
Program Coordinators	66%	21%	9%	2%	2%	87%
Residence Halls	3%	9%	29%	32%	3%	12%
Food	21%	29%	38%	12%		50%
Recreational Activities	32%	26%	35%	3%		59%
	Excep-					
Berkeley, CA (2)	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
38 Participants						
Economics Team	76%	16%	5%	3%		92%
Leadership Team	21%	16%	29%	21%	13%	37%
Program Coordinators	39%	20%	27%	9%	5%	60%
Residence Halls	3%	27%	57%	14%		30%
Food	3%	14%	46%	27%	11%	16%
Recreational Activities	22%	35%	35%	5%	3%	57%
	Excep-					
Oberlin, OH	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
30 Participants						
Economics Team	59%	28%	10%		3%	86%
Leadership Team	65%	28%	3%	2%	2%	93%
Program Coordinators	74%	18%	7%	1%		92%
Residence Halls	30%	43%	17%	7%	3%	73%
Food	10%	13%	47%	27%	3%	23%
Recreational Activities	43%	20%	23%	13%		63%
	Excep-					
Winston-Salem, NC	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
40 Participants						
Economics Team	60%	30%	10%			90%
Leadership Team	40%	38%	18%	5%		78%
Program Coordinators	56%	28%	14%	1%	1%	84%
Residence Halls	41%	21%	31%	8%		62%
Food	18%	18%	31%	28%	5%	36%
Recreational Activities	39%	39%	16%	3%		79%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

Ithaca, NY		Excep-					
Economics Team	Ithaca, NY	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Leadership Team 39% 34% 26% 74% Program Coordinators 50% 32% 11% 4% 3% 81% 8	39 Participants						
Program Coordinators 50% 32% 11% 4% 3% 81%	Economics Team	50%	39%	11%			89%
Residence Halls	Leadership Team	39%	34%	26%			74%
Food 16% 42% 16% 13% 3% 58% Recreational Activities 21% 34% 26% 11% 3% 55% 55%	Program Coordinators	50%	32%	11%	4%	3%	81%
Food 16% 42% 16% 13% 3% 58% Recreational Activities 21% 34% 26% 11% 3% 55% 55%							
Exceptoal							
Providence, RI							
Providence, RI	Recreational Activities	21%	34%	26%	11%	3%	55%
Providence, RI		Excep-					
Seconomics Team	Providence. RI	•	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team							
Program Coordinators 61% 24% 11% 3% 1% 86% Residence Halls 6% 14% 44% 22% 14% 19% Food 6% 14% 34% 29% 17% 20% Recreational Activities 33% 28% 36% 3% 61% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants 5% 22% 14% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators </td <td>•</td> <td>55%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>11%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>89%</td>	•	55%	34%	11%			89%
Program Coordinators 61% 24% 11% 3% 1% 86% Residence Halls 6% 14% 44% 22% 14% 19% Food 6% 14% 34% 29% 17% 20% Recreational Activities 33% 28% 36% 3% 61% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants 65% 22% 14% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators<					5%		
Residence Halls 6% 14% 44% 22% 14% 19% Food 6% 14% 34% 29% 17% 20% Recreational Activities 33% 28% 36% 3% 61% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants	-				3%	1%	
Food 6% 14% 34% 29% 17% 20% Recreational Activities 33% 28% 36% 3% 61% 61%	G						
Recreational Activities 33% 28% 36% 3% 61%	Residence Halls	6%	14%	44%	22%	14%	19%
Santa Barbara, CA Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants 86% 22% 14% 86% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Seattle, WA Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S Seattle, WA 48% 45% 6% 94% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42%	Food	6%	14%	34%	29%	17%	20%
Santa Barbara, CA tional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants 65% 22% 14% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptionals Seattle, WA 5 5 6 63% Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% <	Recreational Activities	33%	28%	36%	3%		61%
Santa Barbara, CA tional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 38 Participants 65% 22% 14% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptionals Seattle, WA 5 5 6 63% Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% <							
Economics Team		Excep-					
Economics Team 65% 22% 14% 86% Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptionals Seattle, WA tional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 31 Participants Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Santa Barbara, CA	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Leadership Team 54% 19% 19% 8% 73% Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptonal State Indicated a section of the sect	•						
Program Coordinators 71% 22% 7% 1% 93% Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor Poor E+S 31 Participants Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%		65%					
Residence Halls 26% 29% 34% 8% 3% 55% Food 34% 29% 32% 5% 63% Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 31 Participants 5% 6% 94% Leadership Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	•	54%	19%		8%		73%
Food Recreational Activities 34% 29% 32% 26% 11% 5% 63% 63% 63% 26% Seattle, WA Exceptional Superb Good Good Fair Poor E+S Good Fair Poor	Program Coordinators	71%	22%	7%		1%	93%
Food Recreational Activities 34% 29% 32% 26% 11% 5% 63% 63% 63% 26% Seattle, WA Exceptional Superb Good Good Fair Poor E+S Good Fair Poor	Paridonea Halls	26%	20%	2/10/	00/	20/	EE9/
Recreational Activities 32% 32% 26% 11% 63% Seattle, WA Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 31 Participants 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%						3/0	
Seattle, WA Exceptional storage Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 31 Participants 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%							
Seattle, WA tional Superb Good Fair Poor E+S 31 Participants Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Recreational Activities	3270	32/0	2070	11/0		0370
31 Participants Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%		Excep-					
Economics Team 48% 45% 6% 94% Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Seattle, WA	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Leadership Team 61% 16% 10% 5% 77% Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	31 Participants						
Program Coordinators 65% 31% 4% 96% Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Economics Team	48%	45%	6%			94%
Residence Halls 48% 29% 19% 3% 77% Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Leadership Team	61%	16%	10%	5%		77%
Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Program Coordinators	65%	31%	4%			96%
Food 19% 23% 42% 13% 3% 42%	Residence Halls	48%	29%	19%	3%		77%
						3%	
NEGLEGISTIAL ACTIVITIES #370 3370 (370 U70 ATM)	Recreational Activities	45%	35%	13%	6%	370	81%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

	Excep-					
Ann Arbor, MI	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
35 Participants						
Economics Team	74%	24%	3%			97%
Leadership Team	76%	24%				100%
Program Coordinators	69%	24%	7%			93%
Residence Halls	29%	29%	35%	6%		59%
Food	9%	12%	41%	29%	9%	21%
Recreational Activities	18%	24%	56%	3%		41%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Overall		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
69	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	39%	51%	7%	1%	1%	90%
	Clear Content	51%	42%	4%	1%		93%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	51%	43%	3%	3%		94%
	Clear Content	54%	39%	3%	1%	3%	93%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	28%	3%	1%		96%
	Challenging Content	43%	48%	7%		1%	91%
Overall	Recommend Program	65%	26%	6%		3%	91%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Houston, T	x	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	J	J		J	· ·	
Morning	Stimulated Interest	33%	67%				100%
· ·	Clear Content	44%	56%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	33%	67%				100%
	Clear Content	44%	56%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	22%	11%			89%
	Challenging Content	44%	44%	11%			89%
Overall	Recommend Program	67%	33%				100%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Los Angeles	s CΔ	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
_	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutrai	Disagree	Disagree	34.4
Morning	Stimulated Interest	61%	33%		6%		94%
William	Clear Content	61%	39%		070		100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	61%	39%				100%
Aitemoon	Clear Content	61%	39%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
	Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	78%	22%				100%
010.0	necommena i rogium	7 0 7 0	22/0				20070
		Strongly				Strongly	
Oberlin, Ol	ł	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	47%	47%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	71%	18%	6%			88%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
	Clear Content	76%	12%	6%		6%	88%
	Responsive Instructors	59%	35%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content						
	Chancing ing Content	59%	35%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	59% 71%	35% 18%	6% 6%		6%	94% 88%
Overall						6% Strongly	
Overall Seattle, WA	Recommend Program	71%			Disagree		
Seattle, WA	Recommend Program	71% Strongly	18%	6%	Disagree	Strongly	88%
Seattle, WA	Recommend Program	71% Strongly	18%	6%	Disagree	Strongly	88%
Seattle, WA	Recommend Program A Participants	71% Strongly Agree	18%	6% Neutral	Disagree 4%	Strongly Disagree	88% SA+A
Seattle, WA	Recommend Program A Participants Stimulated Interest	71% Strongly Agree 20%	18% Agree 60%	6% Neutral 16%	_	Strongly Disagree	88% SA+A 80%
Seattle, WA 25 Morning	Recommend Program A Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content	71% Strongly Agree 20% 32%	18% Agree 60% 56%	6% Neutral 16% 8%	4%	Strongly Disagree	88% SA+A 80% 88%
Seattle, WA 25 Morning	Recommend Program A Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest	71% Strongly Agree 20% 32% 36%	18% Agree 60% 56% 48%	6% Neutral 16% 8% 8%	4% 8%	Strongly Disagree 4%	88% SA+A 80% 88% 84%
Seattle, WA 25 Morning	Recommend Program Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content	71% Strongly Agree 20% 32% 36% 36%	18% Agree 60% 56% 48% 52%	6% Neutral 16% 8% 8%	4% 8% 4%	Strongly Disagree 4%	88% SA+A 80% 88% 84% 88%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accomodations

	Excep-					
Overall	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
69 Participants						
Professors	61%	27%	8%	3%	1%	88%
Mentor Teachers	65%	26%	7%	1%		91%
Program Components						
Lectures	41%	38%	19%	1%	1%	78%
Activities	57%	30%	13%			87%
Overall	48%	41%	9%	3%		88%
Residence Halls	16%	22%	39%	9%	4%	38%
Food	24%	22%	41%	13%		46%
Recreational Activities	17%	17%	29%	3%	1%	34%
			Some-			
		Quite a Bit	what	No		
Changed Understanding		62%	33%			

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

Houston, TX 9 Participants	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professors	56%	28%	17%			83%
Mentor Teachers	78%	11%	11%			89%
Program Components						
Lectures	11%	67%	22%			78%
Activities	44%	56%				100%
Overall	33%	67%				100%
Residence Halls			56%	22%	11%	0%
Food		22%	44%	33%		22%
Recreational Activities			44%		11%	0%
			Some-			
		Quite a Bit	what	No		
Changed Understanding		67%	33%			
	Excep-					
Los Angeles, CA	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
18 Participants		30 p 3 1 3	3333			
Professors	83%	17%				100%
Mentor Teachers	83%	17%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	56%	39%	6%			94%
Activities	61%	22%	17%			83%
Overall	61%	39%				100%
Residence Halls	22%	33%	28%	6%	6%	56%
Food	47%	12%	41%			59%
Recreational Activities	38%	25%	13%	6%		63%
			Some-			
		Quite a Bit	what	No		
Changed Understanding		72%	28%			

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Excep-					
Oberlin, OH	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
17 Participants						
Professors	65%	18%	12%	6%		82%
Mentor Teachers	71%	18%	12%			88%
Program Components						
Lectures	59%	12%	29%			71%
Activities	65%	29%	6%			94%
Overall	71%	18%	12%			88%
Residence Halls	12%	12%	47%	12%	6%	24%
Food	18%	35%	47%			53%
Recreational Activities	12%	24%	24%	6%		35%
			Some-			
		Quite a Bit	what	No		
Changed Understanding		65%	35%			
	Ехсер-					
Seattle, WA	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
25 Participants	tional	Superb	Good	· un	1 001	
Professors	44%	40%	8%	4%	4%	84%
Mentor Teachers	44%	44%	8%	4%	470	88%
	1 170	,,	0,0	170		00/0
Program Components						
Lectures	28%	44%	20%	4%	4%	72%
Activities	52%	28%	20%			80%
Overall	28%	48%	16%	8%		76%
Residence Halls	20%	28%	36%	4%		48%
Food	20%	20%	36%	24%		40%
Recreational Activities	12%	12%	40%			24%
			Some-			
		Quite a Bit	what	No		
Changed Understanding		52%	36%	12%		

Table 6. Economic History for Leaders

Student Evaluations of Sessions, Staff Members, Accommodations, and Performance on Achievement Tests

Medford, MA

		Strongly				Strongly	
	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Morning	Stimulated Interest	19%	65%	13%	3%		84%
	Clear Content	32%	52%	13%	3%		84%
	Challenging Content	23%	45%	26%	6%		68%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	35%	13%	6%		81%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	42%	35%	23%			77%
	Clear Content	48%	29%	13%	6%	3%	77%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	35%	10%	3%	6%	81%
Overall	Recommend Program	35%	55%	6%			90%
	Improve Understanding	42%	42%	16%			84%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics		52%	26%	16%	6%		77%
Leadership	Program	44%	32%	19%	3%	2%	76%
Program Co	pordinators	48%	30%	18%	3%	1%	78%
Residence I	Halls	6%	16%	55%	23%		23%
Food		6%	42%	32%	13%	6%	48%
Recreation	al Activities	26%	35%	29%	10%		61%
Pre- and Po	ost-test Results	Due toot	Doot toot	Cain			
		Pre-test	Post-test	Gain			
		49%	62%	13%			
St. Louis, N	10						
		Strongly				Strongly	
31	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
31 Morning	Participants Stimulated Interest	Agree 26%	Agree 55%	Neutral 13%	Disagree 3%	Disagree 3%	SA+A 81%
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_			_	_	
	Stimulated Interest	26%	55%		_	_	81%
	Stimulated Interest Clear Content	26% 55%	55% 45%	13%	3%	_	81% 100%
	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content	26% 55% 39%	55% 45% 42%	13% 16%	3%	_	81% 100% 81%
Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors	26% 55% 39% 61%	55% 45% 42% 35%	13% 16% 3%	3%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97%
Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest	26% 55% 39% 61% 26%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39%	13% 16% 3% 19%	3% 3% 13%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65%
Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10%	3% 3% 13%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13%	3% 3% 13% 6%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19%	3% 3% 13% 6%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 84% 74%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19%	3% 3% 13% 6%	3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 84% 74%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19%	3% 3% 13% 6%	3% 3% 3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81%
Morning Afternoon Overall	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6%	3% 3% 3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81%
Morning Afternoon Overall Economics	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3%	3% 3% 3%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program pordinators	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7%	3% 3% 3% Poor	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program pordinators	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17% 40%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7% 3%	3% 3% 3% Poor 6%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program pordinators Halls	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7%	3% 3% 3% Poor	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co Residence I Food Recreations	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program Program Pordinators Halls	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17% 40% 23%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24% 10% 53%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7% 3%	3% 3% Poor 6%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co Residence I Food Recreations	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program pordinators Halls	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44% 47% 3% 13%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17% 40% 23% 47%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24% 10% 53% 37%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7% 3%	3% 3% Poor 6%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%
Afternoon Overall Economics Leadership Program Co Residence I Food Recreations	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Team Program Program Pordinators Halls	26% 55% 39% 61% 26% 29% 45% 29% 55% Exceptional 41% 60% 44%	55% 45% 42% 35% 39% 55% 39% 45% 26% Superb 38% 35% 17% 40% 23%	13% 16% 3% 19% 10% 13% 19% 19% Good 17% 3% 24% 10% 53%	3% 3% 13% 6% 6% Fair 3% 2% 7% 3%	3% 3% Poor 6%	81% 100% 81% 97% 65% 84% 74% 81% E+S 79% 95% 61%

Table 7. Economic History for Leaders
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Medford, N		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	! Participants						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	50%	46%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	58%	42%		***		100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	58%	38%	***	4%		96%
	Clear Content	67%	29%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	13%	40/			100%
Overall	Challenging Content	58% 79%	38% 21%	4%			96% 100%
Overall	Recommend Program	79%	2170				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professor		75%	17%	8%			92%
Mentor Tea	acher	63%	25%	13%			88%
Program Co	omponents						0%
	Lectures	46%	38%	17%			83%
	Activities	46%	42%	13%			88%
	Overall	46%	38%	17%			83%
Residence	Halls	41%	18%	32%	9%		59%
Food	italis	46%	4%	38%	13%		50%
Recreation	al Activities	15%	31%	46%	8%		46%
recreation	ar recivities	1370		4070	070		4070
			Some-				
		Quite a Bit	what	No			
Changed U	nderstanding	75%	25%				
		Strongly				Strongly	
		Strongry				Judigiy	
St. Louis, N	10	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	10 Farticipants		Agree	Neutral	Disagree		SA+A
	Stimulated Interest	Agree	47%	Neutral	Disagree		100%
15	Section Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content	Agree 53% 67%	47% 33%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100%
15	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest	Agree 53% 67% 60%	47% 33% 40%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100%
15 Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content	Agree 53% 67% 60% 80%	47% 33% 40% 20%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100% 100%
15 Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors	Agree 53% 67% 60% 80% 87%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content	Agree 53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
15 Morning	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors	Agree 53% 67% 60% 80% 87%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content	Agree 53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33%	Neutral	Disagree		100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33%	Neutral Good	Disagree Fair		100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Excep-	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13%			Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 67% 87% Exceptional	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13%	Good		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40%	Good		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20%	Good 13%		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 40%	Good		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100% 0% 87%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33%	Good 13%		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27%	Good 13%		Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100% 0% 87% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27% 60%	Good 13% 13%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 67%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall Halls	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73% 7% 40%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27% 60% 27%	Good 13% 13% 33% 27%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 67% 67%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall Halls	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27% 60%	Good 13% 13%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% E+S 87% 100% 0% 87% 100%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall Halls	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73% 7% 40% 17%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27% 60% 27% 17% Some-	Good 13% 13% 33% 27% 50%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 67% 67%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co Residence Food Recreations	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall Halls al Activities	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73% 7% 40% 17% Quite a Bit	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 27% 60% 27% 60% 27% 5ome- what	Good 13% 13% 33% 27%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 67% 67%
Morning Afternoon Overall Professor Mentor Tea Program Co Residence Food Recreations	Stimulated Interest Clear Content Stimulated Interest Clear Content Responsive Instructors Challenging Content Recommend Program acher components Lectures Activities Overall Halls	53% 67% 60% 80% 87% 67% 87% Exceptional 47% 80% 47% 67% 73% 7% 40% 17%	47% 33% 40% 20% 13% 33% 13% Superb 40% 20% 40% 33% 27% 60% 27% 17% Some-	Good 13% 13% 33% 27% 50%	Fair	Disagree	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 67% 67%

Table 8. Economic Issues for Teachers Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Atlanta, GA

		Strongly				Strongly	
32	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Stimulated Interest	69%	28%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	69%	31%				100%
	Challenging Content	66%	34%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	31%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	91%	9%				100%
	Improve Teaching	78%	22%				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Topics	Demise of Soviet Union	50%	28%	22%			78%
	Issues of International Trade	59%	34%	6%			94%
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor	59%	25%	13%	3%		84%
	Economics of Water Use and the Environment	53%	31%	13%	3%		84%
Professo	or	69%	13%	19%			81%
Mentor	Teacher	84%	9%	6%			94%
Meeting	g Spaces	39%	35%	26%			74%
Food		41%	38%	22%			78%

Table 9. Environment and the Economy
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Hollywood Beach, FL

	Strongly				Strongly	
31 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	84%	16%				100%
Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
Challenging Content	94%	6%				100%
Responsive Instructors	87%	10%	3%			97%
Recommend Course	87%	13%				100%
Improve Teaching	84%	13%	3%			97%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	77%	18%	5%			95%
Meeting Space	35%	39%	23%	3%		74%
Food	23%	42%	29%	71%		65%

Overall

		Strongly				Strongly	
222	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	71%	24%	4%	1%		95%
	Clear Content	80%	18%	1%			99%
	Challenging Content	78%	18%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				100%
	Recommend Program	78%	18%	4%			95%
	Improve Teaching	68%	28%	5%			95%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	72%	23%	5%			95%
	Program Site	43%	30%	26%	1%		73%
	Food	53%	24%	18%	2%	1%	77%

Starkville, MS

		Strongly				Strongly	
26	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	69%	23%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	65%	27%	4%	4%		92%
	Challenging Content	69%	15%	15%			85%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	19%	4%			96%
	Recommend Program	65%	19%	12%			85%
	Improve Teaching	54%	27%	19%			81%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	69%	12%	15%	4%		81%
	Program Site	23%	23%	50%	4%		46%
	Food	65%	8%	19%	4%		73%
lackson M	c						
Jackson, M	3	Strongly				Strongly	
44	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	75%	23%		2%		98%
	Clear Content	82%	18%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	14%	2%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
	Recommend Program	84%	14%	2%			98%
	Improve Teaching	64%	34%	_,,	2%		98%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	73%	25%	2%			98%
	Program Site	39%	34%	27%			73%
	Food	48%	27%	23%	2%		75%
51 10	.,						
Edmond, O	К	Strongly				Strongly	
20	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	75%	15%	10%	Disagree	Disagree	90%
363310113	Clear Content	80%	20%	1070			100%
	Challenging Content	60%	40%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
	Recommend Program	80%	15%	5%			95%
	Improve Teaching	55%	40%	5%			95%
	r						,-
		Excep-				_	
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	75%	20%	5%			95%
	Program Site	30%	45%	20%	5%		75%
	Food	30%	20%	35%	10%	5%	50%

Lincoln, NE

		Strongly				Strongly	
11	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	73%	18%		9%		91%
	Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
	Recommend Program	91%	9%				100%
	Improve Teaching	91%	9%				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	73%	27%				100%
	Program Site	64%	27%	9%			91%
	Food	45%	9%	36%			55%
Little Rock,	AR						
		Strongly				Strongly	
18	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
	Challenging Content	94%	6%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	76%	24%				100%
	Program Site	56%	17%	28%			72%
	Food	56%	39%	6%			94%
Birminghar	n, AL						
		Strongly				Strongly	
17	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	65%	35%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	76%	24%				100%
	Improve Teaching	65%	35%				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	59%	41%				100%
	Program Site	41%	29%	29%			71%
	Food	47%	18%	24%	6%	6%	65%

Murfreesboro, TN

		Strongly				Strongly	
18	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				100%
	Clear Content	72%	28%				100%
	Challenging Content	72%	28%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
	Recommend Program	83%	17%				100%
	Improve Teaching	78%	22%				100%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	78%	22%				100%
	Program Site	56%	33%	11%			89%
	Food	56%	33%	11%			89%
Bentonville	, AR						
		Strongly				Strongly	
21	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	67%	29%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	86%	14%				100%
	Challenging Content	76%	24%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				100%
	Recommend Program	67%	29%	5%			95%
	Improve Teaching	67%	29%	5%			95%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	71%	24%	5%			95%
	Program Site	38%	29%	33%			67%
	Food	86%	10%	5%			95%
Gulfport, N	15						
		Strongly				Strongly	
15	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	60%	27%	13%			87%
	Clear Content	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
	Recommend Program	67%	27%	7%			93%
	Improve Teaching	67%	27%	7%			93%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	73%	13%	13%			87%
	Program Site	60%	27%	13%			87%
	Food	47%	33%	20%			80%

Tulsa, OK

		Strongly				Strongly	
20	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	65%	30%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
	Challenging Content	80%	20%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
	Recommend Program	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Improve Teaching	65%	25%	10%			90%
		Ехсер-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	65%	25%	10%			90%
	Program Site	55%	25%	20%			80%
	Food	60%	30%	10%			90%
Little Rock,	AR						
		Strongly				Strongly	
12	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
	Recommend Program	92%	8%				100%
	Improve Teaching	75%	25%				100%
		Ехсер-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	83%	17%				100%
	Program Site	42%	33%	17%			75%
	Food	33%	42%	17%			75%

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Overall

	Strongly				Strongly	
120 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	58%	34%	7%	1%		93%
Clear Content	60%	37%	2%	2%		97%
Challenging Content	51%	41%	7%	1%		92%
Responsive Instructors	74%	23%	3%			98%
Recommend Course	63%	30%	6%	2%		92%
Improve Teaching	58%	35%	4%	1%		93%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	55%	34%	8%	2%	2%	89%
Meeting Space	43%	40%	15%	2%		83%
Food	49%	31%	15%	3%	1%	80%

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Edmond, OK

	Strongly				Strongly	
10 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	60%	40%				100%
Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
Challenging Content	60%	40%				100%
Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
Recommend Course	70%	30%				100%
Improve Teaching	80%	20%				100%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	70%	30%				100%
Meeting Space	50%	40%		10%		90%
Food	30%	40%	10%	10%		70%
Wilson, NC						
,	Strongly				Strongly	
24 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	67%	25%	8%	J	J	92%
Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
Challenging Content	71%	25%		4%		96%
Responsive Instructors	96%	4%				100%
Recommend Course	67%	25%	8%			92%
Improve Teaching	63%	21%	8%			83%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	67%	29%	4%			96%
Meeting Space	29%	46%	21%	4%		75%
Food	46%	29%	17%	8%		75%
Boise, ID						
20.00, 12	Strongly				Strongly	
10 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	10%			90%
Clear Content	70%	30%				100%
Challenging Content	70%	20%	10%			90%
Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				100%
Recommend Course	80%	10%	10%			90%
Improve Teaching	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	70%	20%	10%			90%
Meeting Space	60%	30%	10%			90%
Food	50%	20%	30%			70%

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Wichita, KS

	Strongly				Strongly	
21 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	48%	33%	14%	5%		81%
Clear Content	57%	38%		5%		95%
Challenging Content	55%	35%	10%			90%
Responsive Instructors	67%	24%	10%			90%
Recommend Course	45%	45%	5%	5%		90%
Improve Teaching	52%	38%	5%	5%		90%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	52%	33%	10%		5%	86%
Meeting Space	48%	29%	20%			76%
Food	57%	29%	14%			86%
Tanaka KC						
Topeka, KS	Strongly				Strongly	
20 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	80%	20%	iveditai	Disagree	Disagree	100%
Clear Content	95%	5%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
0 0	95%	23% 5%				100%
Responsive Instructors Recommend Course						100%
	95%	5% 20%				
Improve Teaching	80%	20%				100%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	80%	15%	5%			95%
Meeting Space	55%	40%	5%			95%
Food	75%	25%				100%
Orange City, IA						
	Strongly				Strongly	
15 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	20%	73%	7%			93%
Clear Content	20%	73%	7%			93%
Challenging Content		87%	13%			87%
Responsive Instructors	47%	53%				100%
Recommend Course	33%	53%	13%			87%
Improve Teaching	20%	80%				100%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	20%	67%	13%			87%
Meeting Space	47%	47%	7%			93%
Food	33%	33%	27%			67%
	33,0	23/0	_,,,			,-

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Denver, CO

	Strongly				Strongly	
20 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	60%	35%	5%			95%
Clear Content	30%	60%	5%	5%		90%
Challenging Content	25%	60%	15%			85%
Responsive Instructors	50%	45%	5%			95%
Recommend Course	55%	35%	5%	5%		90%
Improve Teaching	50%	45%	5%			95%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	30%	45%	10%	10%	5%	75%
Meeting Space	25%	45%	30%			70%
Food	40%	40%	15%		5%	80%

Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues
Teacher Evaluations

Overall

Strongly				Strongly	
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
59%	40%	1%			99%
83%	17%				100%
71%	27%	1%			99%
86%	13%	1%			99%
76%	24%				100%
66%	33%	1%			99%
Ехсер-					
tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
71%	29%				100%
39%	43%	19%			81%
20%	50%	23%	4%		70%
	Agree 59% 83% 71% 86% 76% 66% Exceptional 71% 39%	Agree Agree 59% 40% 83% 17% 71% 27% 86% 13% 76% 24% 66% 33% Exceptional Superb 71% 29% 39% 43%	Agree Agree Neutral 59% 40% 1% 83% 17% 71% 27% 1% 86% 13% 1% 76% 24% 66% 33% 1% Exceptional Superb Good Good 71% 29% 39% 43% 19%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree 59% 40% 1% 83% 17% 1% 71% 27% 1% 86% 13% 1% 76% 24% 66% 33% 1% Exceptional Superb Good Fair 71% 29% 39% 43% 19%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree 59% 40% 1% 83% 17% 1% 71% 27% 1% 86% 13% 1% 76% 24% 66% 33% 1% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor 71% 29% 39% 43% 19%

Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues
Teacher Evaluations

Roanoke, VA

Roalloke, VA						
	Strongly				Strongly	
18 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				100%
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
Challenging Content	78%	17%	6%			94%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	94%	6%				100%
Improve Teaching	89%	11%				100%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	89%	11%	0000			100%
Meeting Space	50%	33%	17%			83%
Food	50%	33%	17%			83%
	3073	33,1	_,,,			33,1
St. Cloud, MN						
	Strongly				Strongly	
16 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	63%	38%				100%
Clear Content	88%	13%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	69%	31%				100%
Improve Teaching	63%	38%				100%
	Evcon					
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	63%	38%	Good	raii	POOI	100%
	6%	63%	31%			69%
Meeting Space Food	13%	31%	38%	19%		44%
1000	13/6	31/0	30/0	1970		44/0
Honolulu, HI						
	Strongly				Strongly	
4 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	75%	25%		J	J	100%
Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	75%	25%				100%
. 5						
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	75%	25%				100%
Meeting Space	75%	25%				100%
Food	25%	25%	50%			50%

Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues
Teacher Evaluations

St. Charles, MO

,						
	Strongly				Strongly	
12 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	25%	75%				100%
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
Recommend Course	50%	50%				100%
Improve Teaching	50%	42%	8%			92%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	58%	42%				100%
Meeting Space	33%	42%	25%			75%
Food	17%	25%	42%			42%
Newark, DE						
	Strongly				Strongly	
20 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	55%	40%	5%			95%
Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
Challenging Content	60%	40%				100%
Responsive Instructors	75%	20%	5%			95%
Recommend Course	75%	25%				100%
Improve Teaching	55%	45%				100%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	70%	30%				100%
Meeting Space	50%	40%	10%			90%
Food		100%				100%

Table 13. Economics of Disasters Online (EODO) Teacher Evaluations

EODO Spring 2018

	Strongly				Strongly	
11 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	82%	18%				100%
Clear Content	45%	45%		9%		91%
Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
Responsive Instructors	73%	18%	9%			91%
Timely Return of Assignments	82%	18%				100%
Recommend Course	70%	20%		10%		90%
Improve Teaching		90%		10%		90%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	36%	64%				100%
Lectures	18%	64%	9%	9%		82%
Activities	27%	45%	27%			73%
Assignments	27%	45%	27%			73%
Materials	27%	55%	18%			82%
Discussion Boards	27%	36%	36%			64%

Table 14. Teacher Economics: The Federal Reserve System (TE - FR)

Teacher Evaluations

TE - FR Winter 2018

	Strongly				Strongly	
14 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	71%	21%		7%		93%
Clear Content	64%	29%	7%			93%
Challenging Content	57%	36%		7%		93%
Responsive Instructors	79%	14%	7%			93%
Timely Return of Assignments	86%	7%		7%		93%
Recommend Course	64%	21%	7%	7%		86%
Improve Teaching	50%	36%	7%	7%		86%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	71%	7%	14%	7%		79%
Lectures	14%	36%	29%	14%		50%
Activities and Activity Videos	21%	57%	7%	7%		79%
Assignments	36%	43%	7%	14%		79%
Materials	43%	36%	7%	7%	7%	79%
Discussion Boards	21%	43%	29%		7%	64%

Table 15. Teacher Economics - World Development Teacher Evaluations

TE-WD

	Strongly				Strongly	
10 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				100%
Clear Content	70%	30%				100%
Challenging Content	50%	40%	10%			90%
Responsive Instructors	70%	20%	10%			90%
Timely Return of Assignments	80%	20%				100%
Recommend Course	60%	10%	20%	10%		70%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	60%	30%	10%			90%
Lectures	10%	40%	50%			50%
Activities	10%	50%	20%	10%		60%
Assignments	20%	60%	10%	10%		80%
Materials	20%	50%	30%			70%
Discussion Boards	20%	50%	10%			70%

Table 16. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT)

Teacher Evaluations

Overall

	Strongly				Strongly	
32 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	59%	31%	7%			90%
Clear Content	49%	44%	4%			93%
Challenging Content	59%	41%	41%			100%
Responsive Instructors	80%	13%	13%			93%
Timely Return of Assigments	86%	14%	14%			100%
Recommend Course	56%	24%	24%	4%	3%	79%
	Ехсер-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	40%	33%	17%	8%		73%
Lectures	16%	33%	48%	0%		49%
Activities	31%	52%	14%	4%		83%
Assignments	23%	27%	36%	11%		50%
Materials	23%	43%	20%	15%	0%	65%
Discussion Boards	20%	43%	27%	8%	3%	63%

Table 16. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT Part 1 and 2)

Teacher Evaluations

EOFT-2 Fall 2017

Strongly				Strongly	
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
63%	25%	13%			88%
38%	50%		13%		88%
50%	50%				100%
75%	13%	13%			88%
88%	13%				100%
50%	25%	13%		13%	75%
Ехсер-					
tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
38%	25%	25%			63%
13%	38%	38%		13%	50%
13%	75%	13%			88%
25%	25%	38%		13%	50%
25%	63%	13%			88%
13%	50%	25%		13%	63%
	Agree 63% 38% 50% 75% 88% 50% Exceptional 38% 13% 25% 25%	Agree Agree 63% 25% 38% 50% 50% 50% 75% 13% 88% 13% 50% 25% Exceptional Superb 38% 25% 13% 38% 13% 75% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25% 25%	Agree Agree Neutral 63% 25% 13% 38% 50% 50% 50% 75% 13% 13% 88% 13% 50% 25% 13% Exceptional Superb Good 38% 25% 25% 13% 38% 38% 13% 75% 13% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 63% 13%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree 63% 25% 13% 38% 50% 13% 50% 50% 13% 75% 13% 13% 88% 13% 13% 50% 25% 13% Exceptional Superb Good Fair 38% 25% 25% 13% 38% 38% 13% 75% 13% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 25% 38% 25% 63% 13%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree 63% 25% 13% 38% 50% 13% 50% 50% 13% 75% 13% 13% 88% 13% 13% 50% 25% 13% 13% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor 38% 25% 25% 13% 38% 38% 13% 13% 75% 13% 13% 25% 25% 38% 13% 25% 25% 38% 13%

EOFT-1 Winter 2018

	Strongly				Strongly	
12 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	75%	17%				92%
Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	75%	17%	8%			92%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	42%	50%	8%			92%
Lectures	25%	42%	33%			67%
Activities	33%	58%	8%			92%
Assignments	25%	25%	50%			50%
Materials	33%	42%	25%			75%
Discussion Boards	25%	50%	25%			75%

Table 16. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT Part 1 and 2)

Teacher Evaluations

EOFT - 2 Summer 2018

Strongly				Strongly	
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
40%	50%	10%			90%
40%	50%	10%			90%
50%	50%				100%
80%	10%	10%			90%
80%	20%				100%
40%	30%	20%	10%		70%
Excep-					
tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
40%	20%	20%	20%		60%
10%	20%	70%			30%
40%	30%	20%	10%		70%
20%	30%	20%	30%		50%
10%	30%	20%	40%		40%
20%	30%	30%	20%		50%
	Agree 40% 40% 50% 80% 40% Exceptional 40% 10% 40% 20% 10%	Agree Agree 40% 50% 40% 50% 50% 50% 80% 10% 80% 20% 40% 30% Exceptional Superb 40% 20% 10% 20% 40% 30% 20% 30% 10% 30% 10% 30% 10% 30%	Agree Agree Neutral 40% 50% 10% 40% 50% 10% 50% 50% 10% 80% 10% 10% 80% 20% 20% 40% 30% 20% Exceptional Superb Good 40% 20% 20% 10% 20% 70% 40% 30% 20% 20% 30% 20% 10% 30% 20% 10% 30% 20%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree 40% 50% 10% 40% 50% 10% 50% 50% 10% 80% 10% 10% 80% 20% 40% 40% 30% 20% 10% Exceptional tional Superb Good Fair 40% 20% 20% 20% 10% 20% 70% 10% 40% 30% 20% 10% 20% 30% 20% 30% 10% 30% 20% 40%	Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree 40% 50% 10% 40% 50% 10% 50% 50% 80% 10% 80% 20% 40% 30% 20% 10% Exceptional Superb Good Fair Poor 40% 20% 20% 20% 10% 20% 70% 10% 40% 30% 20% 10% 20% 30% 20% 30% 10% 30% 20% 40%

Table 17. Economics History Online for Teachers Teacher Evaluations

EHOFT Part 1 Summer 2018

	Strongly				Strongly	
10 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	50%	40%		10%		90%
Clear Content	70%	20%		10%		90%
Challenging Content	70%	30%				100%
Responsive Instructors	70%	10%	10%			80%
Timely Return of Assignments	80%	20%				100%
Recommend Course	60%	30%		10%		90%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	70%	20%			10%	90%
Lectures	30%	40%	10%	20%		70%
Activities	50%	20%	20%	10%		70%
Assignments	30%	40%	20%		10%	70%
Materials	30%	40%	20%	10%		70%

Table 18. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online (EDSUO) Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

EDSUO

	Strongly				Strongly	
13 Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	85%	8%			8%	92%
Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%
Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	77%	23%				100%
Improve Teaching	40%	50%		10%		90%
	Excep-					
	tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	85%	15%				100%
Lectures	62%	15%	15%	8%		77%
Activities	54%	38%	8%			92%
Assignments	46%	31%	23%			77%
Materials	62%	31%	8%			92%
Discussion Boards	46%	38%	15%			85%

Table 19. World of Economics Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Overall		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
189	Participants						
	Stimulated Interest	28%	55%	15%	2%		83%
	Clear Content	53%	42%	4%	1%	1%	95%
	Challenging Content	40%	10%	4%	1%	1%	50%
	Responsive Instructors	47%	11%	11%	1%	1%	57%
Overall	Recommend Program	41%	15%	15%	1%	1%	57%
	Improve Understanding	26%	44%	12%	1%	1%	70%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	47%	33%	17%	1%		80%
	Meeting Space	9%	6%	1%			15%
	Food	8%	5%	2%			14%

Table 19. World of Economics Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Alexandria		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
75	Participants						
	Stimulated Interest	39%	51%	9%	1%		89%
	Clear Content	51%	44%	4%		1%	95%
	Challenging Content	35%	52%	13%		1%	87%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	39%	13%		1%	84%
Overall	Recommend Program	28%	44%	24%	3%	1%	72%
	Improve Understanding	35%	47%	16%	1%	1%	81%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	41%	36%	20%	2%	1%	77%
	Meeting Space						0%
	Food						0%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Grand June	tion, CO	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	0	0				
	Stimulated Interest	39%	42%	16%	3%		81%
	Clear Content	65%	35%				100%
	Challenging Content	61%	39%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	32%	10%			90%
Overall	Recommend Program	68%	29%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding						0%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	65%	27%	8%			92%
	Meeting Space	55%	39%	6%			94%
	Food	52%	32%	10%	6%		84%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Omaha, NE		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	J	J		J	J	
	Stimulated Interest	14%	64%	20%	1%		78%
	Clear Content	51%	43%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	36%	49%	11%	4%		86%
	Responsive Instructors	43%	48%	8%			92%
Overall	Recommend Program	43%	41%	12%	4%		84%
	Improve Understanding	29%	58%	12%	1%		87%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	46%	32%	19%	1%	1%	78%
	Meeting Space						0%
	Food						0%

Table 20. Innovation and Entrepreneurship Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Overall		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
159	Participants						
	Stimulated Interest	16%	43%	28%	7%	7%	58%
	Clear Content	42%	40%	13%	3%	3%	82%
	Challenging Content	33%	16%	13%	4%	4%	49%
	Responsive Instructors	41%	16%	16%	2%	2%	57%
Overall	Recommend Program	23%	31%	31%	5%	5%	53%
	Improve Understanding	20%	38%	8%	1%	1%	58%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	36%	31%	20%	2%		66%

Table 20. Innovation and Entrepreneurship Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly				Strongly	
Tampa, FL		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
24	1 Participants						
	Stimulated Interest	21%	42%	29%	4%	4%	63%
	Clear Content	46%	42%	8%		4%	88%
	Challenging Content	33%	42%	13%	8%	4%	75%
	Responsive Instructors	54%	25%	17%		4%	79%
Overall	Recommend Program	33%	25%	38%		4%	58%
	Improve Understanding	38%	42%	13%	4%	4%	79%
		Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	46%	33%	13%	4%		79%
		Strongly				Strongly	
St. Charles	MO	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
	Participants	Agree	Agree	Neutrai	Disagree	Disagree	JAIA
7.	Stimulated Interest	20%	43%	31%	6%		63%
	Clear Content	63%	29%	8%	070		92%
	Challenging Content	51%	39%	6%	2%	2%	90%
	Responsive Instructors	51%	45%	4%	2/0	270	96%
Overall	Recommend Program	27%	41%	27%	6%		67%
0.10.1	Improve Understanding	41%	47%	10%	0,10	2%	88%
	, ,	Excep-					
		tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	47%	35%	6%	1%	1%	82%
	moti deter everan	1775	3370	0,0	170	1/0	02/0
		Strongly				Strongly	
Farmingto		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
40) Participants						
	Stimulated Interest	10%	60%	30%			70%
	Clear Content	33%	58%	10%			90%
					E0/		
	Challenging Content	25%	53%	18%	5%		78%
	Responsive Instructors	30%	55%	15%			85%
Overall	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	30% 15%	55% 45%	15% 25%	15%		85% 60%
Overall	Responsive Instructors	30%	55%	15%			85%
Overall	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	30% 15%	55% 45%	15% 25%	15%		85% 60%
Overall	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	30% 15% 8%	55% 45%	15% 25%	15%	Poor	85% 60%
Overall	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program	30% 15% 8% Excep-	55% 45% 70%	15% 25% 13%	15% 10%	Poor 1%	85% 60% 78%
Overall	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26%	55% 45% 70% Superb	15% 25% 13% Good	15% 10% Fair	1%	85% 60% 78% E+S
	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26% Strongly	55% 45% 70% Superb 34%	15% 25% 13% Good 25%	15% 10% Fair 14%	1% Strongly	85% 60% 78% E+S 60%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26%	55% 45% 70% Superb	15% 25% 13% Good	15% 10% Fair	1%	85% 60% 78% E+S
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26% Strongly Agree	55% 45% 70% Superb 34%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral	15% 10% Fair 14%	1% Strongly Disagree	85% 60% 78% E+S 60%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS 6 Participants	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26% Strongly Agree	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree	1% Strongly	85% 60% 78% E+S 60%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS Farticipants Stimulated Interest Clear Content	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26% Strongly Agree	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree 28% 37%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral 22% 22%	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree	1% Strongly Disagree 22% 7%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A 41% 61%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS 6 Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content	30% 15% 8% Excep- tional 26% Strongly Agree	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree	1% Strongly Disagree 22%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS Farticipants Stimulated Interest Clear Content	30% 15% 8% Exceptional 26% Strongly Agree 13% 24% 20%	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree 28% 37% 26%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral 22% 22% 28%	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree 15% 11% 17%	1% Strongly Disagree 22% 7% 9%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A 41% 61% 46%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS 5 Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors	30% 15% 8% Exceptional 26% Strongly Agree 13% 24% 20% 33% 20%	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree 28% 37% 26% 30%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral 22% 22% 28% 28%	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree 15% 11% 17% 4%	1% Strongly Disagree 22% 7% 9% 4%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A 41% 61% 46% 63%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS 5 Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors	30% 15% 8% Exceptional 26% Strongly Agree 13% 24% 20% 33% 20% Excep-	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree 28% 37% 26% 30% 17%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral 22% 22% 28% 28% 37%	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree 15% 11% 17% 4% 11%	1% Strongly Disagree 22% 7% 9% 4% 15%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A 41% 61% 46% 63% 37%
Madison, I	Responsive Instructors Recommend Program Improve Understanding Instructor Overall MS 5 Participants Stimulated Interest Clear Content Challenging Content Responsive Instructors	30% 15% 8% Exceptional 26% Strongly Agree 13% 24% 20% 33% 20%	55% 45% 70% Superb 34% Agree 28% 37% 26% 30%	15% 25% 13% Good 25% Neutral 22% 22% 28% 28%	15% 10% Fair 14% Disagree 15% 11% 17% 4%	1% Strongly Disagree 22% 7% 9% 4%	85% 60% 78% E+S 60% SA+A 41% 61% 46% 63%

Table 21. FTE 2017 Program Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire

Overall

			Some-		
81	Respondents	Very Much	what	Not at All	
	Enthusiasm for Teaching Increased	67%	31%	2%	
	Confidence in Teaching Economics Increased	58%	40%	2%	
		Yes	No		
	Have Used Program Materials in Classroom	88%	12%		
	Have Recommended FTE Programs and Materials	92%	8%		
		Much		No	Not
		Better	Better	Difference	Applicable
	My Students Have a Better Understanding	51%	41%	3%	4%