

**STATISTICAL DATA  
2022 FTE Annual Report**

**PART I: STUDENT EVALUATIONS**

**Table 1a. Economics for Leaders (EFL)  
Pre-Post Test Results**

	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Increase</b>
EFL University of Texas, Austin	74.00%	85.38%	15.38%
EFL University of California, Berkeley (1)	76.15%	87.61%	15.04%
EFL University of California, Berkeley (2)	72.65%	83.42%	14.67%
EFL Cornell University (1)	78.05%	83.01%	6.35%
EFL Cornell University (2)	73.42%	86.15%	17.34%
EFL Emory University	72.35%	83.43%	15.32%
EFL Rice University	68.89%	76.48%	11.02%
EFL University of California, Santa Barbara	71.18%	79.17%	11.23%
EFL University of California, Los Angeles	74.36%	77.89%	4.75%
EFL University of California, Los Angeles (Advanced)	82.16%	91.71%	11.62%
EFL University of Washington, Seattle	70.63%	82.19%	16.37%
EFL Washington University, St. Louis	79.03%	84.41%	6.80%
EFL Yale University (1)	73.49%	82.56%	12.34%
EFL Yale University (2)	80.00%	87.36%	9.21%
EFL Tufts University	78.48%	88.11%	12.27%
EFL Virtual Week 1	81.35%	89.35%	9.83%
EFL Virtual Week 2	77.44%	83.33%	7.62%
EFL Virtual Week 3	85.00%	89.47%	5.26%
EFL Virtual Week 4	77.00%	85.53%	11.07%
EFL Virtual Week 5	77.18%	83.95%	8.77%
EFL Virtual Week 6	87.06%	90.20%	3.60%
<b>Overall Percent</b>	<b>76.66%</b>	<b>84.80%</b>	<b>10.76%</b>

**Table 1b: Economic Forces in American History (EFIAH)  
Pre-Post Test Results**

	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Increase</b>
EFIAH Yale	61.48%	74.62%	21%

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

<b>Overall</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i>725 Respondents</i>						
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	51%	9%	3%		88%
	Clear Content	55%	39%	5%	1%		94%
	Challenging Content	38%	49%	10%	2%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	28%	4%	1%		95%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	42%	35%	14%	6%	2%	78%
	Clear Content	43%	41%	12%	4%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	59%	32%	6%	2%	1%	91%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	45%	42%	10%	2%	1%	87%
	Improve Understanding	52%	39%	8%	1%		91%

<b>UC, Berkeley 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i>38 Respondents</i>						
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	40%	50%	5 %	5%		90%
	Clear Content	71%	26%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	50%	47%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	24%	2%			98%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	24%	50%	16%	8%	2%	74%
	Clear Content	37%	50%	13%			87%
	Responsive Instructors	48%	47%	5%			95%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	21%	55%	21%		3%	76 %
	Improve Understanding	61%	34%	5%			95%

<b>UC, Berkeley 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i>15 Respondents</i>						
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	47%	47%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	73%	27%				100%
	Challenging Content	40%	60%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	20%	7%			93%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	73%	20%			7%	93%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	60%	40%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	80%	20%				100%
	Improve Understanding	47%	53%				100%

<b>Cornell 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>43 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	42 %	51%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	47%	44%	7%	2%		91%
	Challenging Content	30%	54%	14%	2%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	60%	40%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	33%	37%	21%	7%	2%	70%
	Clear Content	28%	53%	19%			81%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	40%	2%			98%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	42%	42%	14%		2%	84%
	Improve Understanding	50%	38%	12%			88%

<b>Cornell 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>38 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	46%	40%	11%	3%		86%
	Clear Content	53%	39%	8%			92%
	Challenging Content	42%	47%	11%			89%
	Responsive Instructors	55%	40%	5%			95%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	40%	29%	24%	5%	2%	69%
	Clear Content	40%	34%	18%	5%	3%	74%
	Responsive Instructors	37%	47%	11%	5%		84%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	42%	50%	8%			92%
	Improve Understanding	58%	34%	8%			92%

<b>Emory University Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	50%	44%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	62%	32%	3%	3%		94%
	Challenging Content	53%	38%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	15%	6%			94%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	44%	35%	21%			79%
	Clear Content	27%	47%	26%			74%
	Responsive Instructors	41%	44%	9%	6%		85%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	65%	29%	3%	3%		94%
	Improve Understanding	53%	44%	3%			97%

<b>Rice University Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>33 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	24%	64%	12%			88%
	Clear Content	58%	33%	9%			91%
	Challenging Content	33%	52%	9%			85%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	27%	6%			94%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	52%	39%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	52%	48%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	42%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	54%	36%	9%			91%
	Improve Understanding	33%	64%	3%			97%

<b>Tufts University Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>33 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	18%	64%	18%			82%
	Clear Content	36%	58%	3%	3%		94%
	Challenging Content	18%	61%	12%	9%		79%
	Responsive Instructors	55%	42%	3%			97%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	30%	37%	24%	6%	3%	67%
	Clear Content	27%	37%	21%	15%		64%
	Responsive Instructors	43%	27%	15%	15%		70%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	21%	49%	24%	3%	3%	70%
	Improve Understanding	21%	49%	15%	9%	6%	70%

<b>University of Michigan Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>37 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	46%	41%	8%	5%		87%
	Clear Content	65%	30%	3%	2%		95%
	Challenging Content	49%	38%	8%	5%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	22%	14%			87%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	21%	30%	32%	14%	3%	51%
	Clear Content	38%	32%	19%	8%	3%	70%
	Responsive Instructors	41%	34%	16%	5%	5%	74%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	46%	33%	16%	5%		79%
	Improve Understanding	51%	33%	16%			84%

UC, Santa Barbara Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	11%	69%	11%	9%		80%
	Clear Content	31%	60%	3%	6%		91%
	Challenging Content	23%	60%	17%			83%
	Responsive Instructors	43%	29%	11%	17%		72%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	43 %	40%	6%	8%	3%	83%
	Clear Content	54%	40%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	29%	57%	9%	6%		86%
	Improve Understanding	43%	3%	17%	6%	3%	74%

UCLA 1 <sup>st</sup> Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>37 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	38%	54%	5%	3%		92%
	Clear Content	60%	35%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	49%	43%	5%	3%		92%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	62%	33%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	54%	46%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	70%	25%	5%			95%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	65%	32%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	60%	32%	5%	3%		92%

UCLA 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	6%	60%	23%	6%	5%	66%
	Clear Content	29%	63%	5%		3%	92%
	Challenging Content	23%	60%	14%		3%	83%
	Responsive Instructors	54%	29%	11%		6%	83%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	37%	9%	9%	8 %	74%
	Clear Content	31%	46%	17%	3%	3%	77%
	Responsive Instructors	52%	34%	11%		3%	86%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	23%	46%	20%	11%		69%
	Improve Understanding	40%	46%	11%	3%		86%

University of Washington Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>32 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	41%	56%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	59%	38%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	34%	50%	10%	6%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	56%	44%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	66%	19%	9%	6%		85%
	Clear Content	63%	25%	10%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	16%	3%			97%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	69%	28%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	60%	34%	6%			94%

UT, Austin Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>41 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	59%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	64%	29%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	34%	51%	15%			85%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	29%	7%			93%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	54%	39%	2%	5%		93%
	Clear Content	51%	32%	10%	7%		83%
	Responsive Instructors	44%	41%	10%	5%		85%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	51%	47%	2%			98%
	Improve Understanding	61%	32%	7%			93%

Washington University Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>30 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	27%	66%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	37%	50%	7%	6%		87%
	Challenging Content	33%	34%	26 %	7%		67%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	63%	30%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	53 %	40%	4%	3%		93%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	13%	4%	3%		93%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	50.00%	43%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	47%	46%	7%			93%

Yale University 1 <sup>st</sup> Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>43 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	24%	52%	12%	10%	2%	76%
	Clear Content	43%	45%	10%	2%		88%
	Challenging Content	33%	50%	14%		3%	83%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	31%	2%			98%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	29%	50%	12%	7%	2%	79%
	Clear Content	24%	48%	12%	14%	2%	72%
	Responsive Instructors	52%	36%	7%	3%	2%	88%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	48%	33%	12%	2%	5%	81%
	Improve Understanding	50%	43%	5%	2%		93%

Yale University 2 <sup>nd</sup> Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>42 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	65%	26 %	7%	2%		91%
	Clear Content	69%	22%	5%	2%	2%	91%
	Challenging Content	38%	55%	2%	5%		93%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	10%	2%			98%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	36%	33%	17%	7%	7%	69%
	Clear Content	36%	36%	17%	9 %	2%	72%
	Responsive Instructors	60%	26%	14%			86%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	48%	38%	9%	3%	2%	86%
	Improve Understanding	74%	19%	7%			93%

1 <sup>st</sup> Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>38 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	42%	16%	8%		76%
	Clear Content	58%	37%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	40%	47%	10%	3%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	29%	3%			97 %
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	39%	32%	16%	8%	5%	71%
	Clear Content	45%	39%	13%	3%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	32%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	40%	39%	16%	5%		79%
	Improve Understanding	40%	47%	10%		3%	87%

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>15 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	40%	53%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	60%	40%				100%
	Challenging Content	40%	60%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	53%	13%			87%
	Clear Content	40%	60%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	53%	47%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	33%	60%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	53%	47%				100%

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	43%	57%				100%
	Clear Content	54%	40%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	46%	46%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	51%	49%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	40%	20%	3%		77%
	Clear Content	34%	54%	11%			89%
	Responsive Instructors	57%	43%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	34%	63%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	51%	43%	6%			94%

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>38 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	55%	40%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	74%	21%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	45%	53%		2%		98%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	18%	5%	3%		92%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	55%	34%	8%	3%		89%
	Clear Content	66%	34%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	87%	13%				100%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	58%	34%	5%	3%		92%
	Improve Understanding	53%	37%	10%			90%



<b>5<sup>th</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	42%	49%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	61%	39%				100%
	Challenging Content	46%	42%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	43%	21%	18%	15%	3%	64%
	Clear Content	52%	30%	18%			82%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	15%	3%			97%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	33%	49%	15%	3%		82%
	Improve Understanding	58%	39%	3%			97%

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

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>725 Respondents</i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	55%	27%	14%	3%	1%	82%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	57%	23%	13%	6%	1%	80%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	55%	26%	12%	4%	1%	81%
<i>Program Facilities (566 out of 725)</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	16%	28%	34%	17%	5%	44%
<b>Food Service</b>	23%	26%	32%	15%	4%	49%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	26%	32%	25%	12%	4%	58%
<i>Application Platforms (159 out of 725)</i>						
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	44%	29%	22%	4%	1%	73%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	43%	30%	23%	3%	1%	73%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	57%	22%	13%	7%	1%	79%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	48%	30%	17%	4%	1%	78%

<b>UC, Berkeley 1 Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>38 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>	61%	34%	5%			95%	
<b>Leadership Team</b>	42%	34%	11%	13%		76%	
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	47%	41%	6%	5%	1%	88%	
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
<b>Residence Halls</b>	8%	10%	50%	32%		18%	
<b>Food Service</b>	5%	13%	42%	24%	16%	18%	
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	10%	16%	29%	26%	13%	26%	5%

<b>UC, Berkeley 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>15 Respondents</i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	86%	7%	7%			93%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	93%	7%				100%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	75%	18%	7%			93%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	8%	17%	42%	25%	8%	25%
<b>Food Service</b>	0%	0%	42%	42%	16%	0%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	17%	8%	50%	17%	8%	25%

<b>Cornell 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>43 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	44%	27%	26%	3%		71%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	34%	20%	26%	17 %	3%	54%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	56%	29%	12%	1%		85%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	15%	29%	35%	15%	6%	44%
<b>Food Service</b>	47 %	35%	9%	9%		82%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	24%	26%	32%	9%	3%	50%

<b>Cornell 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i><u>38 Respondents</u></i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>	41%	43%	13%	3%		84%	
<b>Leadership Team</b>	57%	38%	5%			95%	
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	17%	28%	18%	3%	4%	45%	30%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
<b>Residence Halls</b>	3%	6%	35%	35%	21%	9%	
<b>Food Service</b>	35%	33%	29%	3%		68%	
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	21%	32%	26%	12%	6%	53%	3%

<b>Emory University Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>34 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	86%	12%	2%			98%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	67%	18%	9%	3%		85%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	69%	18%	10%	3%		87%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	24%	27%	18%	21%	9%	51%
<b>Food Service</b>	27%	31%	21%	21%		58%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	52%	33%	12%	3%		85%

<b>Rice University Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>	52%	27%	18%	3%		79%	
<b>Leadership Team</b>	73%	24%	3%			97%	
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	65 %	21%	4%	2%		86%	10%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
<b>Residence Halls</b>	15%	15%	49%	18%	3%	30%	
<b>Food Service</b>	9%	27%	52%	12%		36%	
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	24%	40%	27%	6%	3%	64%	

<b>Tufts University Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	39%	31%	24%	6%		70%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	34%	38%	22%	6%		72%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	39%	24%	17%	16%	4%	63%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	3%	22%	41%	25%	9%	25%
<b>Food Service</b>	9%	16%	50%	22%	3%	25%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	6%	41%	28%	19%	3%	47%

<b>University of Michigan Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>37 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	68%	14%	12%	3%	3%	82%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	16%	14%	43%	27%		30%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	51%	21%	24%	4%		72%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	27%	38%	27%	8%		65%
<b>Food Service</b>	19%	14%	46%	13%	8%	33%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	27%	11%	30%	22%	5%	38%

<b>UC, Santa Barbara Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>35 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	19%	28%	34%	13%	6%	47%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	69%	20%	6%	5%		89%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	67%	24%	7%	2%		91%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	3%	17%	60%	17%	3%	20%
<b>Food Service</b>	20%	54%	17%	9%		74%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	34%	37%	23%	6%		71%

<b>UCLA 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>37 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	60%	35%	5%			95%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	54%	35%	8%	3%		89%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	49%	28%	15%	4%	3%	77%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	22%	32%	32%	14%		54%
<b>Food Service</b>	35%	35%	27%	3%		70%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	30%	35%	30%	5%		65%

<b>UCLA 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>35 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	46%	28%	17%	6%	3%	74%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	74%	14%	6%	6%		88%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	60%	21%	13%	5%	1%	81%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	6%	17%	51%	20%	6%	23%
<b>Food Service</b>	26%	31%	32%	6%	5%	57%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	23%	34%	31%	6%	3%	57%

<b>University of Washington Cohort</b> <i><u>32 Respondents</u></i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Economics Team</b>	50%	36%	14%			86%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	75%	22%	3%			97%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	54%	26%	15%	3%		80%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	23%	51%	13%	13%		74%
<b>Food Service</b>	7%	3%	45%	35%	10%	10%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	32%	55%	13%			87%

<b>UT, Austin Cohort</b> <i><u>41 Respondents</u></i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Economics Team</b>	63%	27%	5%	5%		90%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	80%	15%	5%			95%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	72%	18%	6%	4%		90%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	13%	42%	38%	7%		55%
<b>Food Service</b>	5%	25%	38%	27%	5%	30%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	38%	25%	30%	7%		63%

<b>Washington University Cohort</b> <i><u>30 Respondents</u></i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Economics Team</b>	50%	27%	17%	6%		77%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	90%	7%		3%		97%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	52%	23%	14%	6%	1%	75%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	20%	50%	17%	7%	6%	70%
<b>Food Service</b>	7%	13%	37%	27%	16%	20%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	10%	34%	10%	33%	13%	44%

<b>Yale University 1<sup>st</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>43 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	43%	26%	24%	7%		69%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	21%	12%	34%	19%	14%	33%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	52%	30%	13%	3%	2%	82%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	26%	38%	24%	10%	2%	64%
<b>Food Service</b>	29%	38%	24%	7%	2%	67%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	45%	33%	17%	5%		78%

<b>Yale University 2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>42 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	73%	20%	5%		2%	93%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	44%	29%	17%	10%		73%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	62%	18%	13%	5%	2%	80%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	37%	34%	22%	7%		71%
<b>Food Service</b>	52%	29%	14%	5%		81%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	20%	42%	22%	12%	3%	62%

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>38 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	48%	26%	24%	1%	1%	74%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	69%	18%	13%			87%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	44%	34%	18%	4%		78%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	42%	25%	28%	5%		67%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	42%	22%	28%	8%		64%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	53%	17%	16%	11%	3%	70%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	47%	22%	25%	6%		69%

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>15 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	67%	29%	4%			96%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	50%	36%	14%			86%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	57%	36%	7%			93%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	31%	38%	23%	8%		69%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	23%	31%	46%			54%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	54%	15%	31%			69%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	46%	31%	23%			77%

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i><u>35 Respondents</u></i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>	41%	39%	15%	2%		80%	3%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	52%	32%	14%			84%	2%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	32%	24%	15%			56%	29%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	37%	34%	23%		3%	71%	2%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	43%	26%	26%	3%		69%	2%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	40%	32%	14%	9%	3%	72%	2%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	37%	34%	14%	9%	3%	71%	3%

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>38 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	66%	28%	6%			94%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	70%	25%	5%			95%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	66%	28%	6%			94%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	63%	31%	3%	3%		94%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	60%	31%	9%			91%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	80%	14%	6%			94%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	66%	34%				100%



<b>5<sup>th</sup> Week Virtual Cohort</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	70%	20%	10%			90%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	64%	15%	18%	3%		79%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	67%	20%	10%	3%		87%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
<b>Canvas Learning</b>	40%	21%	36%	3%		61%
<b>Zoom Web</b>	36%	40%	18%	3%	3%	76%
<b>Moblab Education</b>	55%	27%	9%	9%		82%
<b>Pear Deck</b>	43%	27%	27%	3%		70%

**Table 4. Economics Forces in American History: Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Yale University		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>27 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	44%	45%		11%		89%
	Clear Content	41%	37%	15%	7%		78%
	Challenging Content	18%	56%	22%	4%		74%
	Responsive Instructors	48%	41%	11%			89%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	44%	37%	11%	4%	4%	81%
	Clear Content	63%	26%	7%		4%	89%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	18%	4%			96%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	44%	45%	7%		4%	89%
	Improve Understanding	30%	55%	15%			85%

**Table 5. Economics Forces in American History: Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Applications**

Yale University		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>27 Respondents</i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>		33%	31%	20%	14%	2%	64%
<b>Leadership Team</b>		71%	22%	4%		3%	93%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>		68%	16%	14%	2%		
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
<b>Residence Halls</b>		44%	15%	33%	4%	4%	59%
<b>Food Service</b>		22%	41%	19%	11%	7%	63%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>		41%	26%	15%	15%		67%

**Table 6a. Entrepreneurship and the Global Economy:  
Student Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i><u>22 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics</b>	Stimulated Interest	64%	36%				100%
	Clear Content	41%	59%				100%
	Challenging Content	41%	50%	9.00%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
<b>Leadership</b>	Stimulated Interest	59%	27%	14.00%			86%
	Clear Content	55%	45%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	23%	4%			96%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	68%	27%	5%			95%
	Improve Understanding	68%	27%		5%		95%

**Table 6b. Entrepreneurship and the Global Economy:  
Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Program Facilities**

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i><u>22 Respondents</u></i>						
<b>Economics Team</b>	43%	40%	17%			83%
<b>Leadership Team</b>	70%	15%	15%			85%
<b>Program Coordinators</b>	58%	29%	6%	6%	1%	87%
<i><u>Program Facilities</u></i>						
<b>Residence Halls</b>	25%	45%	25%	5%		70%
<b>Food Service</b>	50%	15%	35%			65%
<b>Recreational Activities</b>	15%	40%	20%	10%	15%	55%

## **PART II: TEACHER EVALUATIONS**

### **Part II.1: Multi-Day Teacher Programs**

**Table 7. Environment and the Economy:  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>Ft. Lauderdale, FL (June 20-23)</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>15 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
Clear Content	93%	7%				100%
Challenging Content	100%					100%
Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	93%	7%				100%
Professors	83%	17%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Meeting Space	60%	13%	27%			73%
Food	40%	14%	33%	13%		54%
Social Distancing and Safety Measures	67%	13%	7%	7%		80%

<b>Proctorville, AZ (August 8-11)</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
<i><u>28 Respondents</u></i>							
Stimulated Interest	89%	11%				100%	
Clear Content	75%	21%	4%			96%	
Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%	
Recommend Course	89%	7%	4%			96%	
Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%	
Professors	77%	21%	2%			98%	
<i>Program Components</i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Meeting Space	7%	4%	46%	32%	11%	11%	
Food	11%	14%	50%	18%	4%	25%	3%
Social Distancing and Safety Measures	14%	4%	36%	21%	14%	18%	11%

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

<b>Scottsdale, AZ (Jan. 15 - 17)</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>29 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	93%	7%				100%
Clear Content	93%	7%				100%
Challenging Content	97%	3%				100%
Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				100%
Recommend Course	97%	3%				100%
Improve Teaching Professors	97%	3%				100%
	88%	9%	3%			97%
<i>Program Components</i>	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Meeting Space	41%	31%	24%	4%		72%
Food	17%	21%	38%	17%	7%	38%
Social Distancing and Safety Measures	48%	31%	14%	7%		79%

**Table 9: Right Start in Teaching Economics:  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Las Vegas, NV (July 5-8)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	
<u>24 Respondents</u>							
Stimulated Interest	75%	17%	8%			92%	
Clear Content	71%	29%				100%	
Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	83%	13%	4%			96%	
Recommend Course	87%	13%				100%	
Improve Teaching Professors	67%	25%	8%			92%	
	69%	25%	6%			94%	
Program Components	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
Meeting Space	50%	33%	17%			83%	
Food	25%	46%	21%	5%		71%	
Social Distancing and Safety Measures	38%	25%	8%	8%		63%	21%

**Table 10a: Economics for Teachers (In-Person):  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>Emory University Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>11 Respondents</i>							
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	55%	36%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	82%	18%				100%
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	55%	36%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	73%	18%		9%		91%
	Challenging Content	82%	9%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
	Supplemental Materials	50%	50%				100%
	Recommend Program	91%		9%			91%
	Improve Teaching	73%	18%		9%		91%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>Program Components</i>							
<b>Lectures</b>		64%	36%				100%
<b>Activities</b>		36%	45%	18%			8%
<b>Overall Program</b>		37%	36%	18%	9%		72%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>		91%		9%			91%
<b>Leadership Team</b>		73%	18%		9%		91%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
<b>Hotel</b>		0%	0%	36%	27%	18%	0%
<b>Food</b>		36%	37%	18%	9%		73%
<b>Recreation</b>		9%	18%	55%			27%

UC Santa Barbara Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	
<i>13 Respondents</i>								
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	69%	23%	8%			92%	
	Clear Content	92%	8%				100%	
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	85%	15%				100%	
	Clear Content	85%	15%				100%	
	Challenging Content	85%	15%				100%	
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%	
	Supplemental Materials	69%	15%	8%	8%		84%	
	Recommend Program	85%	15%				100%	
	Improve Teaching	62%	38%				100%	
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
<i>Program Components</i>								
<b>Lectures</b>		54%	38%		8%		92%	
<b>Activities</b>		69%	23%	8%			92%	
<b>Overall Program</b>		77%	23%				100%	
<i>Program Staff</i>								
<b>Economics Team</b>		85%	15%				100%	
<b>Leadership Team</b>		85%	15%				100%	
<i>Program Facilities</i>								
<b>Residence Halls</b>		15%	39 %	31%	15%		54%	
<b>Food</b>		62%	31%	8%			92%	
<b>Recreation</b>		31%	31%	15%			62%	23%

University of Washington Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	
<i>8 Respondents</i>								
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	38%	50%	12%			88%	
	Clear Content	63%	37%				100%	
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	63%	37%				100%	
	Clear Content	63%	37%				100%	
	Challenging Content	50%	38%	12%			88%	
	Responsive Instructors	63%	37%				100%	
	Supplemental Materials	63%	37%				100%	
	Recommend Program	63%	37%				100%	
	Improve Teaching	63%	37%				100%	
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
<i>Program Components</i>								
	<b>Lectures</b>	38%	37%	13%	12%		75%	
	<b>Activities</b>	75%	25%				100%	
	<b>Overall Program</b>	38%	50%	13%			88%	
<i>Program Staff</i>								
	<b>Economics Team</b>	50%	25%	25%			75%	
	<b>Leadership Team</b>	75%	25%				100%	
<i>Program Facilities</i>								
	<b>Residence Halls</b>	13%	50%	25%			63%	12%
	<b>Food</b>	25%	13%	37%	25%		38%	
	<b>Recreation</b>	25%	13%	13%	12%		38%	37%



<b>Washington University Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>		
<i><u>7 Respondents</u></i>									
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	43%	29%	28%			72%		
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%		
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%		
	Clear Content	86%	14%				100%		
	Challenging Content	57%	29%	14%			86%		
	Responsive								
	Instructors	86%	14%				100%		
	Supplemental Materials	71%	29%				100%		
	Recommend Program	71%	29%				100%		
	Improve Teaching	57%	43%				100%		
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<i>Program Components</i>									
	<b>Lectures</b>	43%	29%	28%			72%		
	<b>Activities</b>	57%	43%				100%		
	<b>Overall Program</b>	43%	43%	14%			86%		
<i>Program Staff</i>									
	<b>Economics Team</b>	50%	36%	14%			86%		
	<b>Leadership Team</b>	57%	43%				100%		
<i>Program Facilities</i>									
	<b>Residence Halls</b>	43%	29%	28%			72%		
	<b>Food</b>	14%	43%	43%			57%		
	<b>Recreation</b>	14%	43%	14%	14%		57%	14%	

Tufts University Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	
<i>20 Respondents</i>								
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	45%	55.%				100.00%	
	Clear Content	65%	30%	5%			95.00%	
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				100.00%	
	Clear Content	65%	30%	5%			95.00%	
	Challenging Content	40%	50%	10%			90.00%	
	Responsive							
	Instructors	100%					100.00%	
	Supplemental							
	Materials	50%	35%	15%			85.00%	
	Recommend Program	45%	55%				100.00%	
	Improve Teaching	75%	25%				100.00%	
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
<i>Program Components</i>								
<b>Lectures</b>		53%	26%	21%			79%	
<b>Activities</b>		68%	32%				100%	
<b>Overall Program</b>		44%	56%				100%	
<i>Program Staff</i>								
<b>Economics Team</b>		60%	30%	10%			90%	
<b>Leadership Team</b>		75%	25%				100%	
<i>Program Facilities</i>								
<b>Residence Halls</b>		0%	0%	40%	30%	25%	0%	5%
<b>Food</b>		10%	25%	25%	35%	5%	35%	
<b>Location</b>		0%	10%	25%	5%	15%	10%	45%

**Table 10b: Economics for Teachers (Virtual):  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>1st Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>8 Respondents</i>							
Student-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	63%	37%				100%
	Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
Teacher-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	63%	25%	12%			88%
	Clear Content	75%	13%	12%			88%
	Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Supplemental Materials	63%	25%	12%			88%
	Recommend Program	50%	38%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding of Material	63%	25%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	25%	75%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>Program Components</i>							
<b>Lectures</b>		50%	38%	12%			88%
<b>Activities</b>		38%	50.00%	12%			88%
<b>Overall Program</b>		50%	50%				100%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>		69%	31%				100%
<b>Leadership Team</b>		50%	31%				81%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
<b>Canvas Learning</b>		50%	38%	12%			88%
<b>Zoom Web</b>		50%	25%	25%			75%
<b>Moblab Education</b>		75%	13%	12%			88%
<b>Pear Deck</b>		75%	25%				100%

<b>2nd Week Virtual Cohort</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>15 Respondents</u></i>							
Student-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	47%	47%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	60%	40%				100%
Teacher-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	53%	27%	20%			80%
	Clear Content	60%	20%	13%	7%		80%
	Challenging Content	73%	27%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	20%		7%		93%
	Supplemental Materials	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Recommend Program	66%	20%		7%	7%	86.67%
	Improve Understanding of Material	47%	53%				100.00%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	73%	27%				100.00%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>Program Components</i>							
<b>Lectures</b>		60%	33%	7%			93%
<b>Activities</b>		53%	33%	13%			87%
<b>Overall Program</b>		53%	20%	20%		7%	73%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
<b>Economics Team</b>		45%	44%	10%			89%
<b>Leadership Team</b>		47%	47%		6%		94%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
<b>Canvas Learning</b>		47%	40%	7%	6%		87%
<b>Zoom Web</b>		53%	27%	20%			80%
<b>Moblab Education</b>		67%	33%				100%
<b>Pear Deck</b>		67%	27%	6%			94%

**Table 11. Economic Forces in American History:  
Teacher Evaluations**

	<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>						
Lecture Sessions	Stimulated Interest	82%	18%				100%
	Clear Content	85%	15%				100%
Simulation Sessions	Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	91%	6%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	79%	18%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
	Supplemental Materials	79%	21%				100%
	Recommend Program	91%	9%				100%
	Improve Understanding	84%	13%	3%			97%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>Program Components</i>						
	<b>Lectures</b>	76%	21%	3%			97%
	<b>Activities</b>	73%	24%	3%			97%
	<b>Overall Program</b>	85%	12%	3%			97%
	<i>Program Staff</i>						
	<b>Economics Team</b>	79%	18%	3%			97%
	<b>Leadership Team</b>	94%	6%				100%
	<i>Program Facilities</i>						
	<b>Hotel</b>	33%	27%	40%			60%
	<b>Food</b>	22%	9%	56%	13%		31%

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Williamsburg, VA</b>							
<i>13 Respondents</i>							
Lecture Sessions	Stimulated Interest	92%	8%				100%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
Simulation Sessions	Stimulated Interest	46%	54%				100%
	Clear Content	77%	15%	8%			92%
	Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					
	Supplemental Materials	85%	15%				100%
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	92%	8%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>Program Components</i>							
	<b>Lectures</b>	92%	8%				100%
	<b>Activities</b>	46%	23%	31.00%			69%
	<b>Overall Program</b>	62%	38%				100%
<i>Program Staff</i>							0%
	<b>Economics Team</b>	92%	8%				100%
	<b>Leadership Team</b>	69%	23%	8%			92%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
	<b>Hotel</b>	0%	0%	31%	31%	38%	0%
	<b>Food</b>	23%	39%	38%			62%

## Part II.2: Online Teacher Programs

**Table 12. Economic Forces in American History Online:  
Early 20th Century – Present (EFIAHO: Present)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	64%	36%				100%
Clear Content	18%	73%	9%			91%
Challenging Content	36%	55%	9%			91%
Recommend Course	27%	73%				100%
Improve Teaching	64%	36%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	46%	54%				100%
Timely Return of Assignment	91%	9%				100%
Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	36%	18%	46%			54%
Activities	18%	64%	18%			82%
Materials	27%	64%	9%			91%
Written Assignments	9%	46%	45%			55%
Discussion Assignments	18%	46%	36%			64%

**Table 13. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union (EDSUO):  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>14 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	93%	7%				100%
Clear Content	93%	7%				100%
Challenging Content	86%	14%				100%
Recommend Course	86%	14%				100%
Improve Teaching	100%					100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	57%	43%				100%
Timely Return of Assignment	100%					100%
Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	43%	43%	14%			86%
Activities	43%	50%	7%			93%
Materials	43%	50%	7%			93%
Written Assignments	36%	36%	28%			72%
Discussion Assignments	36%	50%	14%			86%



**Table 14. Economics and Environmentalism Online:  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
<i>13 Respondents</i>							
Stimulated Interest	62%	38%				100%	
Clear Content	38%	46%	16%			84%	
Challenging Content	54%	23%	8%	15%		77%	
Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%	
Recommend Course	46%	23%	23%		8%	69%	
Improve Teaching	46%	46%	8%			92%	
Professors	54%	38%	8%			92%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Instructor	54%	38%	8%			92%	
Timely Return of Assignment	54%	46%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%	
<i>Program Components</i>							
Lectures	23%	31%	38%			54%	8%
Activities	31%	31%	23%			62%	15%
Materials	23%	38%	23%		8%	62%	8%
Written Assignments	23%	46%	23%			69%	8%
Discussion Assignments	23%	38%	31%			62%	8%

**Table 15. Economics of Disasters Online (EoDO):  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b> <i>10 Respondents</i>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
Clear Content	50%	30%	10%	10%		80%
Challenging Content	60%	20%	10%	10%		80%
Recommend Course	30%	60%			10%	90%
Improve Teaching	70%	30%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Professor	70%	20%		10%		90%
Timely Return of Assignment	90%		10%			90%
Responsive Instructors	90%		10%			90%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	30%	20%	50%			50%
Activities	10%	50%	30%	10%		60%
Materials	10%	50%	40%			60%
Written Assignments	10%	50%	30%	10%		60%
Discussion Assignments	10%	50%	30%	10%		60%

**Table 16a. Economics Online for Teachers:  
Fundamentals, Principles, and Markets (EOFT Fundamentals)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
	<i><u>4 Respondents</u></i>					
Stimulated Interest	25%	75%				100%
Clear Content	25%	75%				100%
Challenging Content	25%	50%	25%			75%
Recommend Course		100%				100%
Improve Teaching	25%	75%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor		50%	50%			50%
Timely Return of Assignment	100%					100%
Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	25%	25%	50%			50%
Activities	0%	25%	50%	25%		25%
Materials	0%	25%		75%		25%
Written Assignments	0%	50%	50%			50%
Discussion Assignments	0%	25%	50%	25%		25%

**Table 16b. Economics Online for Teachers:  
Institutions, Government and the Economy (EOFT Institutions)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
<i>6 Respondents</i>							
Stimulated Interest	17%	83%				100%	
Clear Content	17%	67%		16%		84%	
Challenging Content	17%	50%	17%	16%		67%	
Recommend Course	17%	50%	33%			67%	
Improve Teaching	17%	67%		16%		84%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Instructor	17%	33%	33%	17%		50%	
Timely Return of Assignment	83%	17%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	17%	67%	16%			84%	
<i>Program Components</i>							
Lectures	17%		50%		16%	17%	17%
Activities	17%	33%	17%	33%		50%	
Materials	17%	33%	17%	17%	16%	50%	
Written Assignments	17%	17%	33%	17%	16%	34%	
Discussion Assignments	17%	17%	33%	17%	16%	34%	

### **Part II.3: One-Day Teacher Programs**

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:  
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>Overall</b> <i>303 Respondents</i>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Stimulated Interest	81%	16%	3%			97%
Clear Content	85%	14%	1%			99%
Challenging Content	83%	15%	2%			98%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	89%	9%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	76%	20%	4%			96%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	77%	15%	5%	1%		92%
Meeting Space	64%	21%	13%	2%		85%
Food	52%	22%	22%	3%		74%

<b>Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt &amp; Deficits (Marietta, GA - March 9, 2022)</b>						
<b>Overall</b> <i>21 Respondents</i>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Stimulated Interest	90%	10%				100%
Clear Content	90%	10%				100%
Challenging Content	86%	14%				100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	90%	10%				100%
Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	81%	14%	5%			95%
Meeting Space	76%	5%	14%	5%		81%
Food	72%	14%	14%			86%

### **Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt & Deficits (El Paso, TX - January 28-29, 2022)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
<i><u>26 Respondents</u></i>							
Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%	
Clear Content	92%	8%				100%	
Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%	
Instructor							
Responsiveness	96%	4%				100%	
Recommend Course	100%					100%	
Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Instructor	96%	4%				100%	
Meeting Space	81%	8%				89%	11%
Food	73%	12%	15.00%			85%	

### **Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt and Deficits (El Paso, TX - November 6, 2021)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
<i><u>6 Respondents</u></i>							
Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%	
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%	
Challenging Content	100%					100%	
Instructor							
Responsiveness	83%	17%				100%	
Recommend Course	100%					100%	
Improve Teaching	83%	17%				100%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	
Instructor	100%					100%	
Meeting Space	83%	17%				100%	
Food	83%		17%			83%	

**Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt & Deficits (Ft. Worth/Hurst, TX - March 25-26, 2022)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i><u>19 Respondents</u></i>							
Stimulated Interest	90%		5%	5%		90%	
Clear Content	79%	16%	5%			95%	
Challenging Content	90%		5%	5%		90%	
Instructor Responsiveness	95%	5%				100%	
Recommend Course	90%		10%			90%	
Improve Teaching	74%	16%	5%		5.00%	90%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	
Instructor	84%	11%		5%		95%	
Meeting Space	26%	37%	37%			63%	
Food	32%	26%	21%	5%		58%	16%

**Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt & Deficits (Los Angeles, CA - April 23, 2022)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>13 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	85%	15%				100%
Clear Content	85%	15%				100%
Challenging Content	77%	23%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	77%	23%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	77%	23%				100%
Meeting Space	77%	15%	8%			92%
Food	77%	23%				100%

**Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt & Deficits (San Antonio, TX - July 20, 2022)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>8 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
Clear Content	100%					100%
Challenging Content	100%					100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	100%					100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	100%					100%
Meeting Space	63%	37%				100%
Food	63%	25%	12%			88%

**Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt & Deficits (Wichita Falls, TX - July 15, 2022)**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>27 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	85%	15%				100%
Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Challenging Content	89%	11%				100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	93%	7%				100%
Improve Teaching	85%	15%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	93%	7%				100%
Meeting Space	78%	19%	3%			97%
Food	69%	31%				100%



<b>Fundamentals of Environmental Economics (Columbia, MD - May 21, 2022)</b>						
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>18 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	89%	11%				100%
Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
Challenging Content	94%	6%				100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	94%	6%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	70%	17%	13%			87%
Meeting Space	45%	44%	11%			89%
Food	28%	44%	22%	6%		72%

<b>Fundamentals of Environmental Economics (Jackson, MS - November 4, 2021)</b>						
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>33 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
Challenging Content	91%	9%				100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	97%	3%				100%
Improve Teaching	82%	18%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	80%	18%	2%			98%
Meeting Space	61%	27%	9%	3%		88%
Food	43%	27%	27%		3%	70%

<b>Fundamentals of Environmental Economics (St. Charles, MO - May 14, 2022)</b>						
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>26 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	73%	19%	8%			92%
Clear Content	88%	8%	4%			96%
Challenging Content	88%	8%	4%			96%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	92%	4%	4%			96%
Recommend Course	92%		8%			92%
Improve Teaching	72%	12%	16%			84%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	85%	8%	7%			93%
Meeting Space	81%	15%	4%			96%
Food	65%	16%	19%			81%

<b>Understanding Global Economic Issues (Wytheville, VA - April 26, 2022)</b>						
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>45 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	76%	20%	4%			96%
Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Challenging Content	87%	11%	2%			98%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	87%	13%				100%
Improve Teaching	78%	18%	4%			96%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	81%	17%	2%			98%
Meeting Space	78%	9%	11%	2%		87%
Food	49%	16%	29%	6%		65%

<b>Fundamentals of Environmental Economics (Terre Haute, IN - April 9, 2022)</b>						
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>23 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	70%	26%	4%			96%
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
Challenging Content	70%	30%				100%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	74%	26%				100%
Recommend Course	77%	18%	5%			95%
Improve Teaching	65%	22%	13%			87%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	57%	35%	8%			92%
Meeting Space	65%	31%	4%			96%
Food	57%	26%	17%			83%

<b>Understanding Global Economic Issues (Colorado Springs, CO - July 13, 2022)</b>							
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i><u>38 Respondents</u></i>							
Stimulated Interest	66%	24%	10%			90%	
Clear Content	61%	37%	2%			98%	
Challenging Content	50%	45%	5%			95%	
Instructor							
Responsiveness	79%	21%				100%	
Recommend Course	63%	29%	5%	3%		92%	
Improve Teaching	45%	50%	3%	2%		95%	
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	
Instructor	37%	19%	13%			56%	31%
Meeting Space	29%	29%	39%	3%		58%	
Food	21%	19%	50%	10%		40%	

**Table 17b. One Day Programs:  
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>329 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	74%	24%	1%	1%		98%
Clear Content	76%	23%	1%			99%
Challenging Content	72%	25%	3%			97%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	79%	20%	1%			99%
Recommend Course	82%	16%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	72%	25%	3%			97%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	72%	20%	7%	1%		92%
Virtual Presentation	65%	27%	7%	1%		92%

<b>Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt &amp; Deficits (Feb. 26, 2022)</b>						
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>38 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	73%	27%				100%
Clear Content	70%	27%	3%			97%
Challenging Content	63%	34%	3%			97%
Instructor Responsiveness	71%	24%	5%			95%
Recommend Course	76%	22%	3%			98%
Improve Teaching	71%	21%	8%			92%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	67%	20%	12%	1%		87%
Virtual Presentation	58%	26%	16%			84%

**29 Trillion and Counting: Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt, and Deficits  
(Sept. 18, 2021)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>43 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	74%	26%				100%
Clear Content	81%	19%				100%
Challenging Content	74%	24%	2%			98%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	88%	12%				100%
Recommend Course	93%	7%				100%
Improve Teaching	81%	19%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	71%	23%	6%			94%
Virtual Presentation	70%	26%	4%			96%

**Economic Forces in American History (Oct. 16, 2021)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>46 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	61%	35%	4%			96%
Clear Content	65%	35%				100%
Challenging Content	70%	26%	4%			96%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	70%	28%	2%			98%
Recommend Course	76%	22%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	59%	39%	2%			98%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	67%	23%	9%	1%		90%
Virtual Presentation	61%	28%	11%			89%

**Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?**  
(Nov. 6, 2021)

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>49 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	83%	15%	2%			98%
Clear Content	78%	22%				100%
Challenging Content	84%	14%	2%			98%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	82%	16%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	74%	22%	4%			96%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	81%	16%	3%			97%
Virtual Presentation	67%	29%	4%			96%

**Economic Forces in American History (April 30, 2022)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>52 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	61%	31%	4%	2%		92%
Clear Content	71%	27%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	63%	31%	6%			94%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	66%	30%	2%	2%		96%
Recommend Course	73%	22%	5%			95%
Improve Teaching	62%	32%	2%	4%		94%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	62%	26%	8%	3%	1%	88%
Virtual Presentation	58%	31%	7%	2%	2%	89%

**Issues of International Trade  
(Mar. 26, 2022)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>58 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
Clear Content	84%	16%				100%
Challenging Content	72%	23%	5%			95%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	81%	19%				100%
Recommend Course	83%	15%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	72%	23%	5%			95%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	79%	12%	8%	1%		91%
Virtual Presentation	72%	21%	7%			93%

**Economic Demise of the Soviet Union (Jan. 29, 2022)**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>43 Respondents</u></i>						
Stimulated Interest	82%	16%		2%		98%
Clear Content	79%	19%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	77%	21%		2%		98%
Instructor						
Responsiveness	81%	19%				100%
Recommend Course	91%	7%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	72%	22%	5%	1%		94%
Virtual Presentation	67%	29%	2%	2%		96%

## Part II.4 Virtual Workshops

**Table 18. Virtual Workshops: Teacher Evaluations**

<b>Has the Monster Awakened? Teaching Inflation in Today's Economic Classroom (Sept. 8, 2021)</b>						
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>56 Respondents</i>						
Recommend Course	75%	23%	2%			98%
Improve Understanding	36%	61%	3%			97%
Improve Teaching	57%	39%	2%		2%	96%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Presenter	75%	20%	5%			95%
Topic Rating	53%	38%	9%			91%
	<b>Much Too Short</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>About Right</b>	<b>Too Long</b>	<b>Much Too Long</b>	
Webinar Length	2%	9%	85%	4%		

<b>Is the Supply Chain Broken? Teaching International Trade in Today's Economic Classroom (Jan. 20, 2022)</b>						
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>50 Respondents</i>						
Recommend Course	78%	22%				100%
Improve Understanding	68%	30%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	68%	30%	2%			98%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Presenter	76%	20%	4%			96%
Topic Rating	58%	36%	6%			94%
	<b>Much Too Short</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>About Right</b>	<b>Too Long</b>	<b>Much Too Long</b>	
Webinar Length	2%	2%	86%	8%	2%	



### Get to Know the New Money Supply (April 6, 2022)

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>45 Respondents</i>						
Recommend Course	65%	35%				100%
Improve Understanding	66%	30%	4%			96%
Improve Teaching	62%	36%	2%			98%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Presenter	69%	24%	7%			93%
Topic Rating	58%	40%	2%			98%
	<b>Much Too Short</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>About Right</b>	<b>Too Long</b>	<b>Much Too Long</b>	
Webinar Length		11%	85%	4%		

## Part II.5 Webinars

**Table 19. Webinars: Teacher Evaluations**

<b>Bidenomics: Boom or Bust</b>						
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>49 Respondents</u></i>						
Clear Content	87%	13%				100%
Recommend						
Course	67%	33%				100%
Improve Teaching	59%	39%			2%	98%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	65%	33%	2%			98%
	<b>Much Too Short</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>About Right</b>	<b>Long</b>	<b>Much Too Long</b>	
Webinar Length	4%	10%	82%	4%		

<b>The Economics of Dating: How Economics Can Help Explain Vegas, Spring Break, and Relationships</b>						
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i><u>24 Respondents</u></i>						
Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
Recommend						
Course	75%	21%		4%		96%
Improve Teaching	58%	38%	4%			96%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor	67%	29%	4%			96%
	<b>Much Too Short</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>About Right</b>	<b>Long</b>	<b>Much Too Long</b>	
	4%	13%	83%			