

Table 1. Economics for Leaders
Pre-Post Test Results

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Increase
Houston, TX	72%	80%	8%
Boulder, CO	70%	74%	4%
New Haven, CT (1)	72%	80%	9%
Los Angeles, CA	68%	76%	8%
Berkeley, CA (1)	72%	83%	11%
New Haven, CT (2)	76%	83%	7%
Berkeley, CA (2)	68%	81%	13%
Williamsburg, VA	77%	79%	2%
Winston-Salem, NC	70%	77%	6%
Ithaca, NY	77%	83%	6%
St. Louis, MO	70%	81%	11%
Providence, RI	75%	82%	7%
Oberlin, OH	64%	73%	8%
UW	68%	77%	9%
Overall Percent	71%	79%	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
	<i>460 Participants</i>						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	39%	47%	11%	3%		86%
	Clear Content	54%	40%	6%			93%
	Challenging Content	43%	44%	11%	1%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	62%	29%	7%	1%		91%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	49%	35%	11%	4%	1%	84%
	Clear Content	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%	88%
	Responsive Instructors	62%	28%	9%	1%		90%
Overall	Recommend Program	58%	32%	8%	2%	1%	90%
	Improve Understanding	43%	44%	9%	4%		87%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Houston, TX							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	38%	50%	13%			88%
	Clear Content	56%	41%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	47%	44%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	94%	3%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	78%	22%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	84%	13%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	44%	44%	13%			88%
Boulder, CO							
<i>22 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	18%	41%	27%	9%	5%	59%
	Clear Content	18%	55%	27%			73%
	Challenging Content	9%	64%	23%	5%		73%
	Responsive Instructors	36%	36%	18%	9%		73%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	59%	41%				100%
	Clear Content	59%	41%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	18%	5%			95%
Overall	Recommend Program	55%	27%	18%			82%
	Improve Understanding	9%	73%	9%	5%	5%	82%
New Haven, CT (1)							
<i>34 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	41%	56%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	65%	26%	6%	3%		91%
	Challenging Content	38%	56%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	32%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	24%	44%	21%	6%	6%	68%
	Clear Content	44%	38%	12%	3%	3%	82%
	Responsive Instructors	44%	44%	12%			88%
Overall	Recommend Program	35%	44%	9%	6%	3%	79%
	Improve Understanding	47%	35%	6%	12%		82%
Los Angeles, CA							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	38%	54%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	59%	38%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	57%	35%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	35%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	38%	43%	14%	5%		81%
	Clear Content	27%	65%	5%	3%		92%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	30%	5%			95%
Overall	Recommend Program	62%	35%	3%			97%
Berkeley, CA (1)							
<i>41 Participants</i>							

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

Morning	Stimulated Interest	29%	51%	20%		80%
	Clear Content	56%	39%	5%		95%
	Challenging Content	37%	39%	24%		76%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	29%	7%		93%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	41%	34%	20%	5%	76%
	Clear Content	39%	41%	15%	5%	80%
	Responsive Instructors	54%	34%	10%	2%	88%
Overall	Recommend Program	41%	34%	20%	5%	76%
	Improve Understanding	34%	46%	12%	7%	80%

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
New Haven, CT (2)							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	30%	57%	11%	11%	3%	86%
	Clear Content	54%	35%	11%			89%
	Challenging Content	49%	43%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	54%	35%	11%			89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	57%	35%	5%	3%		92%
	Clear Content	57%	30%	11%	3%		86%
	Responsive Instructors	70%	30%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	35%	5%			95%
	Improve Understanding	46%	41%	14%			86%

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Berkeley, CA (2)							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	37%	50%	11%	3%		87%
	Clear Content	47%	45%	3%	3%	3%	92%
	Challenging Content	34%	55%	8%	3%		89%
	Responsive Instructors	50%	39%	8%	3%		89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	24%	34%	21%	13%	8%	58%
	Clear Content	26%	39%	13%	16%	5%	66%
	Responsive Instructors	29%	42%	21%	8%		71%
Overall	Recommend Program	26%	50%	16%	3%	5%	76%
	Improve Understanding	50%	37%	8%	5%		87%

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Williamsburg, VA							
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	42%	42%	8%	8%		83%
	Clear Content	58%	38%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	29%	67%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	38%	4%			96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	46%	46%	4%	4%		92%
	Clear Content	38%	58%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	46%	42%	8%		4%	88%
Overall	Recommend Program	67%	25%	4%	4%		92%
	Improve Understanding	42%	42%	13%	4%		83%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Winston-Salem, NC							
<i>34 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	29%	56%	9%	6%		85%
	Clear Content	53%	41%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	44%	38%	18%			82%
	Responsive Instructors	62%	32%	3%	3%		94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	35%	50%	9%	6%		85%
	Clear Content	35%	62%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	53%	35%	12%			88%
Overall	Recommend Program	44%	44%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding	41%	41%	15%	3%		82%
Ithica, NY							
<i>42 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	64%	26%	7%	2%		90%
	Clear Content	64%	36%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	26%	5%		2%	93%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	26%	2%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	43%	38%	17%	2%		81%
	Clear Content	45%	36%	19%			81%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	17%	5%			95%
Overall	Recommend Program	79%	17%	2%	2%		95%
	Improve Understanding	38%	52%	2%	7%		90%
St. Louis, MO							
<i>31 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	39%	52%	10%			90%
	Clear Content	39%	55%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	39%	35%	26%			74%
	Responsive Instructors	48%	35%	13%			84%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	58%	32%	6%	3%		90%
	Clear Content	32%	55%	13%			87%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	26%	29%			71%
Overall	Recommend Program	65%	32%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	32%	58%	10%			90%
Providence, RI							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	56%	38%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	34%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	13%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	47%	31%	16%	6%		78%
	Clear Content	50%	34%	13%	3%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	25%	9%	3%		88%
Overall	Recommend Program	66%	25%	9%			91%
	Improve Understanding	63%	34%	3%			97%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Oberlin, OH							
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	54%	29%	17%			83%
	Clear Content	58%	42%				100%
	Challenging Content	42%	46%	8%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	83%	13%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	13%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	83%	17%				100%
	Improve Understanding	50%	38%	13%			88%
University of Washington							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	28%	53%	16%	3%		81%
	Clear Content	38%	47%	16%			84%
	Challenging Content	34%	53%	6%	6%		88%
	Responsive Instructors	28%	28%	34%	6%	3%	56%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	63%	34%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	84%	13%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	16%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	56%	38%	6%			94%
	Improve Understanding	38%	50%	9%	9%		88%

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

Overall	excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>460 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	51%	28%	16%	3%	3%	79%
Leadership Team	58%	30%	9%	2%	2%	88%
Program Coordinators	57%	28%	9%	5%	5%	85%
Residence Halls	24%	30%	25%	14%	4%	54%
Food	17%	23%	31%	22%	6%	40%
Recreational Activities	23%	30%	25%	12%	5%	54%

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

	excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Houston, TX						
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	54%	27%	18%	1%		81%
Leadership Team	69%	31%				100%
Program Coordinators	97%	3%				100%
Residence Halls	53%	41%	6%			94%
Food	41%	34%	22%	3%		75%
Recreational Activities	44%	25%	28%	3%		69%
Boulder, CO						
<i>22 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	16%	0%	23%	11%	2%	16%
Leadership Team	73%	27%				100%
Program Coordinators	41%	41%	5%	9%	5%	82%
Residence Halls	9%	55%	27%	9%		64%
Food	36%	55%		5%	5%	91%
Recreational Activities	50%	41%		5%		91%
New Haven, CT (1)						
<i>34 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	26%	15%			85%
Leadership Team	41%	41%	18%			82%
Program Coordinators	24%	35%	26%	15%		59%
Residence Halls	6%	9%	24%	35%	26%	15%
Food	18%	12%	26%	29%	12%	29%
Recreational Activities	15%	29%	35%	18%	3%	44%
Los Angeles, CA						
<i>37 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	32%	8%			92%
Leadership Team	35%	46%	19%			81%
Program Coordinators	49%	46%	5%			95%
Residence Halls	14%	24%	35%	27%		38%
Food	30%	35%	30%	5%		65%
Recreational Activities	38%	41%	16%	5%		78%

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

Berkeley, CA (1)	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>41 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	46%	37%	17%			83%
Leadership Team	41%	34%	20%	2%		76%
Program Coordinators	51%	37%	10%	2%		88%
Residence Halls	5%	17%	46%	27%	5%	22%
Food	5%	10%	20%	37%	29%	15%
Recreational Activities	15%	12%	46%	24%		27%
New Haven, CT (2)	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>37 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	54%	27%	19%			81%
Leadership Team	68%	27%	5%			95%
Program Coordinators	51%	35%	8%	3%		86%
Residence Halls	5%	22%	32%	32%	8%	27%
Food	5%	16%	41%	32%	5%	22%
Recreational Activities	22%	54%	16%	5%		76%
Berkeley, CA (2)	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>38 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	66%	8%	16%	11%		74%
Leadership Team	34%	29%	21%	8%	8%	63%
Program Coordinators	39%	26%	13%	13%	5%	66%
Residence Halls	11%	26%	37%	16%	11%	37%
Food	8%	21%	29%	29%	13%	29%
Recreational Activities	24%	29%	26%	13%	5%	53%
Williamsburg, VA	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>24 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	50%	17%	17%			67%
Leadership Team	50%	33%	4%	8%		83%
Program Coordinators	63%	29%		4%		92%
Residence Halls	17%	57%	22%	4%		74%
Food	4%	9%	48%	30%	9%	13%
Recreational Activities	9%	22%	26%	30%	4%	30%

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

Winston-Salem, NC	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	46%	35%	24%	10%		81%
Leadership Team	62%	32%	6%			94%
Program Coordinators	44%	26%	18%	12%		71%
Residence Halls	47%	35%	15%			82%
Food	18%	15%	50%	12%	3%	32%
Recreational Activities	18%	29%	24%	18%	9%	47%
Ithaca, NY	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>42 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	50%	36%	14%			86%
Leadership Team	67%	29%	5%			95%
Program Coordinators	71%	21%	7%			93%
Residence Halls	26%	40%	29%	5%		67%
Food	33%	36%	21%	10%		69%
Recreational Activities	21%	26%	40%	5%	2%	48%
St. Louis, MO	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	31%	50%	16%	3%		81%
Leadership Team	61%	29%	10%			90%
Program Coordinators	48%	39%	13%			87%
Residence Halls	65%	29%	3%	3%		94%
Food	10%	32%	42%	13%		42%
Recreational Activities	3%	6%	29%	26%	32%	10%
Providence, RI	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	75%	13%	13%			88%
Leadership Team	78%	16%	6%			94%
Program Coordinators	59%	19%	16%	6%		78%
Residence Halls	13%	31%	34%	16%	6%	44%
Food	9%	28%	34%	25%	3%	38%
Recreational Activities	19%	31%	19%	9%	19%	50%

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

Oberlin, OH	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>24 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	46%	46%	8%			92%
Leadership Team	79%	13%	8%			92%
Program Coordinators	79%	21%				100%
Residence Halls	13%	21%	25%	4%		33%
Food			25%	67%		0%
Recreational Activities	33%	38%	8%	4%		71%
University of Washington	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	44%	31%	20%	5%		75%
Leadership Team	75%	22%		3%		97%
Program Coordinators	84%	13%		3%		97%
Residence Halls	63%	28%	6%	3%		91%
Food	16%	25%	44%	16%		41%
Recreational Activities	28%	47%	16%	6%	3%	75%

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

Overall		strongly			strongly		SA+A
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>93 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	69%	27%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	83%	14%	2%	1%		97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	25%	1%	1%		96%
	Clear Content	82%	14%	3%	1%		96%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	9%	1%			99%
	Challenging Content	74%	24%		2%		98%
Overall	Recommend Program	86%	10%		2%	2%	96%

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

		Strongly				Strongly	
Houston, TX		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>10 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				100%
	Challenging Content	90%	10%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	90%				10%	90%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Boulder, CO		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>13 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	62%	23%	15%			85%
	Clear Content	69%	15%	8%	8%		85%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	62%	15%		8%		77%
	Clear Content	69%	15%	8%	8%		85%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	15%	8%			92%
	Challenging Content	69%	15%		15%		85%
Overall	Recommend Program	85%	8%		8%		92%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Williamsburg, VA		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>10 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	80%	10%	10%			90%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Clear Content	80%	10%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	80%	20%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	20%				100%
		Strongly				Strongly	
Winston-Salem, NC		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	72%	22%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
	Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
	Challenging Content	65%	35%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	78%	11%		6%	6%	89%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
St. Louis, MO							
<i>10 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				100%
	Challenging Content	70%	30%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	90%	10%				100%
Oberlin, OH							
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	72%	28%				100%
	Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				100%
	Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	78%	22%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	100%					100%
University of Washington							
<i>14 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	57%	43%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	21%	7%			93%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
	Clear Content	79%	14%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
	Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	79%	21%				100%

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

Overall	excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>93 Participants</i>						
Professors	77%	20%	2%	1%		97%
Mentor Teachers	71%	26%	2%	1%		97%
Program Components						
Lectures	70%	25%	2%	2%		96%
Activities	60%	34%	4%		1%	95%
Overall	65%	27%	8%			92%
Residence Halls	26%	25%	29%	9%	1%	51%
Food	29%	32%	29%	10%		61%
Recreational Activities	22%	16%	11%	6%	1%	38%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 67%	31%			

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

Houston, TX	excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Professors	75%	25%				100%
Mentor Teachers	90%	10%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	60%	40%				100%
Activities	90%	10%				100%
Overall	80%	10%	10%			90%
Residence Halls	20%		40%	10%	10%	20%
Food	30%	20%	40%	10%		50%
Recreational Activities		10%	30%	10%	10%	10%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		80%	20%			
Boulder, CO						
<i>13 Participants</i>						
Professors	77%	8%	8%	8%		85%
Mentor Teachers	69%	23%		8%		92%
Program Components						
Lectures	62%	23%		15%		85%
Activities	54%	38%			8%	92%
Overall	62%	31%	8%			92%
Residence Halls	31%	15%	15%	15%		46%
Food	54%	23%	8%	15%		77%
Recreational Activities	15%	31%				46%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		85%		8%		

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

Williamsburg, VA	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Professors	100%					100%
Mentor Teachers	40%	40%	20%			80%
Program Components						
Lectures	80%	20%				100%
Activities	30%	40%	30%			70%
Overall	30%	50%	20%			80%
Residence Halls	10%	10%	50%	30%		20%
Food	10%	30%	30%	30%		40%
Recreational Activities	10%		10%	20%		10%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 60%	40%			
Winston-Salem, NC	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>18 Participants</i>						
Professors	94%	6%				100%
Mentor Teachers	83%	17%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	89%	11%				100%
Activities	61%	39%				100%
Overall	81%	19%				100%
Residence Halls	6%	22%	44%	11%		28%
Food	22%	28%	44%	6%		50%
Recreational Activities	6%		11%	11%		6%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 72%	28%			

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

St. Louis, MO	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Professors	60%	30%	10%			90%
Mentor Teachers	70%	30%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	56%	44%				100%
Activities	50%	50%				100%
Overall	20%	60%	20%			80%
Residence Halls	10%	60%	30%			70%
Food	10%	40%	50%			50%
Recreational Activities		20%	20%	10%		20%
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 80%	what 20%	No		
Oberlin, OH	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>18 Participants</i>						
Professors	83%	17%				100%
Mentor Teachers	72%	28%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	83%	17%				100%
Activities	72%	28%				100%
Overall	72%	22%	6%			94%
Residence Halls	56%	39%	6%			94%
Food	44%	56%				100%
Recreational Activities	72%	22%	6%			94%
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 50%	Some- what 50%	No		

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

University of Washington <i>14 Participants</i>	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professors	43%	57%				100%
Mentor Teachers	64%	36%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	50%	36%	14%			86%
Activities	57%	36%	7%			93%
Overall	86%	14%				100%
Residence Halls	36%	21%	29%			57%
Food	21%	21%	43%	14%		43%
Recreational Activities	21%	29%	7%			50%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 50%	50%			

Table 6. Economic History for Leaders (Tufts)

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

Medford, MA

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	32%	45%	13%	6%	3%	77%
	Clear Content	35%	48%	13%	3%		84%
	Challenging Content	13%	58%	23%	6%		71%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	23%	6%			90%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	45%	29%	16%	3%	6%	74%
	Clear Content	42%	48%	6%		3%	90%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	29%	10%			90%
Overall	Recommend Program	48%	23%	19%	3%	6%	71%
	Improve Understanding	26%	58%	6%	6%	3%	84%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team		27%	34%	34%	2%	2%	61%
Leadership Program		45%	26%	19%	10%		71%
Program Coordinators		23%	48%	26%	3%		71%
Residence Halls		6%	19%	55%	10%	10%	26%
Food		16%	35%	35%	10%	3%	52%
Recreational Activities		23%	16%	35%	16%	6%	39%

Pre- and Post-test Results

Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
48%	64%	16%

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

Medford, MA		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	42%	58%				100%
	Clear Content	63%	33%		4%		96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	42%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	58%	33%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
	Challenging Content	46%	50%	4%			96%
Overall	Recommend Program	71%	29%				100%
		exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professors		63%	33%	4%			96%
Mentor Teachers		54%	38%	8%			92%
Program Components							0%
Lectures		46%	38%	17%			83%
Activities		50%	25%	25%			75%
Overall		63%	29%	8%			92%
Residence Halls		17%	4%	50%	13%	4%	21%
Food		29%	21%	50%			50%
Recreational Activities		21%	13%	25%			33%
		Quite a Bit	Some-what	No			
Changed Understanding		58%	42%				

Table 8. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>121 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	57%	39%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	69%	29%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	64%	32%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	20%	1%			99%
	Recommend Program	68%	27%	5%	1%		94%
	Improve Teaching	53%	40%	6%	2%		93%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	64%	26%	9%			91%
	Program Site	50%	31%	17%	3%		81%
	Food	42%	22%	18%	1%		63%

Table 8. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Lynchburg, VA

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	<i>25 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	56%	36%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	64%	32%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	56%	36%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	24%	4%			96%
	Recommend Program	64%	28%	8%			92%
	Improve Teaching	48%	48%	4%			96%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	52%	36%	12%			88%
	Program Site	68%	20%	12%			88%
	Food	68%	20%	12%			88%

Miami, FL

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	<i>6 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
	Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
	Challenging Content	83%	17%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
	Recommend Program	83%	17%				100%
	Improve Teaching	67%	33%				100%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	83%	17%				100%
	Program Site	33%		50%	17%		33%
	Food	50%	33%	17%			83%

Long Beach, CA

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	<i>7 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	86%	14%				100%
	Clear Content	86%	14%				100%
	Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
	Recommend Program	71%	29%				100%
	Improve Teaching	43%	43%	14%			86%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	71%	14%	14%			86%
	Program Site	14%	29%	43%	14%		43%
	Food	43%	43%	14%			86%

Table 8. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Weehawken, NJ

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	80%	20%				100%
	Clear Content	87%	13%				100%
	Challenging Content	87%	7%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	87%	13%				100%
	Recommend Program	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Improve Teaching	80%	13%	7%			93%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Program Site	36%	43%	14%	7%		79%
	Food	47%	20%	33%			67%

Orange City, IA

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>28 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	25%	64%	11%			89%
	Clear Content	46%	50%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	50%	46%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
	Recommend Program	46%	39%	11%	4%		86%
	Improve Teaching	32%	54%	11%	4%		86%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	46%	36%	18%			82%
	Program Site	68%	32%	7%			100%
	Food	46%	29%	25%			75%

Boise, ID

		Strongly			Strongly		
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
<i>22 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	73%	27%				100%
	Clear Content	86%	14%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
	Recommend Program	82%	18%				100%
	Improve Teaching	68%	32%				100%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	82%	18%				100%
	Program Site	41%	41%	18%			82%

Table 8. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

St. Cloud, MN

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	56%	44%				SA+A 100%
	Clear Content	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	28%				100%
	Recommend Program	71%	29%				100%
	Improve Teaching	50%	39%	6%	6%		89%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	67%	28%	6%			94%
	Program Site	39%	33%	22%	6%		72%
	Food	41%	29%	24%	6%		71%

Table 9. Issues of International Trade
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Toronto, ON

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>27 Participants</i>							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	56%	41%	4%			96%
	Binder Useful	59%	33%	7%			93%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	41%	48%	11%			89%
	Well Organized	81%	19%				100%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	93%	7%				
	Would Attend Another	89%	11%				
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+G	
Instructors	Content	78%	20%	2%			98%
	Presentation	81%	17%				98%

Table 10. Economic Forces in American History
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Denver, CO

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	60%	33%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	82%	12%	6%			94%
	Helpful Handouts	82%	12%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	12%	6%			94%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Teaching	82%	12%	6%			94%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Overall	94%	6%				100%
Program	Overall Program	88%	12%				100%
	Program Site	71%	29%				100%

Table 11. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Online

<i>19 Participants</i>	Strongly		Neutral	Disagree	Strongly		SA+A
	Agree	Agree			Disagree	Disagree	
Stimulated Interest	68%	32%					100%
Clear Content	58%	42%					100%
Challenging Content	84%	16%					100%
Responsive Instructors	65%	21%	11%				86%
Timely Return of Assignments	58%	37%	5%				95%
Recommend Course	68%	32%					100%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	
Instructor Overall	42%	47%	11%				89%
Lectures	32%	32%	37%				63%
Activities	32%	42%	26%				74%
Assignments	21%	53%	26%				74%
Materials	21%	58%	21%				79%
Discussion Boards	21%	32%	47%				53%

Table 12. Economics Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

Overall

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>59 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	58%	37%	5%			95%
Clear Content	51%	44%	5%			95%
Challenging Content	59%	41%	41%			100%
Responsive Instructors	80%	14%	14%			93%
Timely Return of Assignments	90%	8%	8%			98%
Recommend Course	62%	21%	21%	3%	2%	83%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	36%	51%	10%	3%		86%
Lectures	31%	37%	27%	5%		68%
Activities	39%	44%	15%	2%		83%
Assignments	21%	43%	33%	3%		64%
Materials	39%	44%	14%	2%	2%	83%
Discussion Boards	15%	54%	27%	2%	2%	69%

Table 12. Economics Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

EOFT-1 Fall 2016

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>8 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	63%	38%				100%
Clear Content	25%	75%				100%
Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
Responsive Instructors	88%		13%			88%
Timely Return of Assignments	88%		13%			88%
Recommend Course	25%	63%	13%			88%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	25%	63%	13%			88%
Lectures	13%	25%	63%			38%
Activities	13%	75%	13%			88%
Assignments	13%	50%	38%			63%
Materials	38%	50%	13%			88%
Discussion Boards		75%	25%			75%

EOFT-2 Fall 2016

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>14 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	43%	57%				100%
Clear Content	64%	36%				100%
Challenging Content	64%	36%				100%
Responsive Instructors	93%		7%			93%
Timely Return of Assignments	93%	7%				100%
Recommend Course	86%	14%				100%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	50%	50%				100%
Lectures	29%	57%	14%			86%
Activities	43%	43%	14%			86%
Assignments	21%	50%	29%			71%
Materials	50%	43%	7%			93%
Discussion Boards	21%	71%	7%			93%

Table 12. Economics Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

EOFT-1 Spring 2017

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>17 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	59%	35%	6%			94%
Clear Content	35%	59%	6%			94%
Challenging Content	53%	47%				100%
Responsive Instructors	76%	18%	6%			94%
Timely Return of Assignments	88%	12%				100%
Recommend Course	53%	12%	24%	6%	6%	65%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	18%	59%	18%	6%		76%
Lectures	29%	35%	24%	12%		65%
Activities	35%	41%	24%			76%
Assignments	12%	41%	35%	12%		53%
Materials	29%	59%	6%		6%	88%
Discussion Boards	12%	41%	35%	6%	6%	53%

EOFT-2 Spring 2017

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>20 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	65%	25%	10%			90%
Clear Content	65%	25%	10%			90%
Challenging Content	65%	35%				100%
Responsive Instructors	70%	25%	5%			95%
Timely Return of Assignments	90%	10%				100%
Recommend Course	68%	16%	11%	5%		84%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	45%	40%	10%	5%		85%
Lectures	40%	30%	25%	5%		70%
Activities	50%	35%	10%	5%		85%
Assignments	32%	37%	32%			68%
Materials	40%	30%	25%	5%		70%
Discussion Boards	20%	45%	35%			65%

Table 13. Economics History Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

Winter 2017

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>14 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	64%	21%	7%	7%		86%
Clear Content	29%	29%	36%	7%		57%
Challenging Content	54%	46%				100%
Responsive Instructors	93%	7%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	50%	14%	14%	21%		64%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	50%	43%	7%			93%
Lectures	14%	43%	29%	14%		57%
Activities	29%	36%	29%	7%		64%
Assignments	14%	43%	36%	7%		57%
Materials	29%	57%	7%	7%		86%
Discussion Boards	29%	36%	29%	7%		64%

Table 14. Teacher Economics: The Federal Reserve System
Teacher Evaluations

Fall 2016

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>3 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%
Responsive Instructors	67%					67%
Timely Return of Assignments	100%					100%
Recommend Course		100%				100%
Improve Teaching	67%		33%			67%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	33%	67%				100%
Lectures		67%				67%
Activities and Activity Videos		100%				100%
Assignments		100%				100%
Materials	33%	67%				100%
Discussion Boards		67%	33%			67%

Spring 2017

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

Table 15. Teacher Economics: Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Overall

<i>46 Participants</i>	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
Stimulated Interest	35%	48%	13%	4%		83%
Clear Content	48%	46%	4%	2%		93%
Challenging Content	43%	41%	15%			85%
Responsive Instructors	61%	39%				100%
Recommend Course	46%	28%	17%	7%		74%
Improve Teaching	35%	26%	26%	11%	2%	61%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	41%	30%	24%	4%		72%
Meeting Space	48%	26%	26%			74%
Food	43%	22%	30%	2%	2%	65%

Table 15. Teacher Economics: Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
Teacher Evaluations

Sterling Heights, MI

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>17 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	35%	35%	24%	6%		71%
Clear Content	53%	41%		6%		94%
Challenging Content	65%	18%	18%			82%
Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Recommend Course	41%	24%	18%	12%		65%
Improve Teaching	29%	24%	29%	12%	6%	53%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	53%	18%	24%	6%		71%
Meeting Space	29%	29%	41%			59%
Food	18%	24%	47%	6%	6%	41%

San Jose, CA

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>9 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	11%	67%	11%	11%		78%
Clear Content	22%	78%				100%
Challenging Content	22%	56%	22%			78%
Responsive Instructors	22%	78%				100%
Recommend Course	33%	33%	22%	11%		67%
Improve Teaching	11%	33%	44%	11%		44%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall		56%	33%	11%		56%
Meeting Space	11%	33%	56%			44%
Food	33%	22%	44%			56%

Springdale, AR

	Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>20 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	45%	50%	5%			95%
Clear Content	55%	35%	10%			90%
Challenging Content	35%	55%	10%			90%
Responsive Instructors	60%	40%				100%
Recommend Course	55%	30%	15%			85%
Improve Teaching	50%	25%	15%	10%		75%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	50%	30%	20%			80%
Meeting Space	80%	20%				100%
Food	70%	20%	10%			90%

Table 16. Economics of Disasters Online
Teacher Evaluations

Online

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>12 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				100%
Clear Content	33%	50%	17%			83%
Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
Responsive Instructors	75%	23%				98%
Timely Return of Assignments	67%	33%				100%
Recommend Course	67%	33%				100%
Improve Teaching	50%	33%	8%	8%		83%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	42%	50%	8%			92%
Lectures	25%	33%	33%	8%		58%
Activities	17%	67%	8%	8%		83%
Assignments	8%	50%	33%			58%
Materials	8%	50%	33%	8%		58%
Discussion Boards		25%	75%			25%

Mississauga, Canada

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>21 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	90%	5%	5%			95%
Recommend Course	86%	5%				90%
Improve Teaching	62%	24%	14%			86%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	81%	14%	5%			95%
Lectures	81%	14%	5%			95%
Materials	67%	29%	5%			95%

Burnaby, BC

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>26 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	65%	35%				100%
Recommend Course	81%				4%	81%
Improve Teaching	50%	42%	4%	4%		92%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	85%	12%	4%			96%
Lectures	88%	12%				100%
Materials	73%	23%				96%

Table 17. World of Economics
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall	strongly			strongly		SA+A
	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
<i>315 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	30%	51%	17%	3%	1%	80%
Clear Content	56%	36%	6%			92%
Challenging Content	42%	10%	6%	1%	1%	52%
Responsive Instructors	52%	16%	16%	1%	1%	68%
Overall Recommend Program	36%	18%	18%	3%	3%	55%
Improve Understanding	26%	30%	4%			56%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	50%	33%	13%	1%		83%
Meeting Space	30%	17%	9%			47%
Food	32%	9%	6%	6%	6%	41%

Table 17. World of Economics
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Denver, CO		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>61 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	10%	59%	31%			69%
	Clear Content	51%	39%	10%			90%
	Challenging Content	34%	51%	13%		2%	85%
	Responsive Instructors	56%	44%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	23%	44%	30%	2%	2%	67%
	Improve Understanding	31%	57%	8%	2%	2%	89%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	51%	39%	7%	2%	1%	90%
	Meeting Space	69%	30%	2%			98%
	Food	79%	13%	8%			92%
Fort Wayne, IN		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>68 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	34%	51%	13%	1%		85%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	38%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	59%	32%	32%			91%
Overall	Recommend Program	49%	31%	19%	1%		79%
	Improve Understanding	56%	40%	4%			96%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	57%	33%	10%			90%
	Meeting Space	59%	26%	9%	6%		85%
	Food	46%	22%	19%	12%	1%	68%
Alexandria, VA		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>62 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	48%	39%	11%	2%		87%
	Clear Content	48%	45%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	48%	39%	11%	2%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	32%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	45%	42%	13%			87%
	Improve Understanding	40%	50%	10%			90%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	48%	36%	12%	4%		84%
	Meeting Space	23%	27%	34%	13%	2%	50%
	Food	38%	6%		25%	31%	44%

Table 17. World of Economics
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Lincoln, NE		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>83 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	28%	52%	14%	5%	1%	80%
	Clear Content	43%	40%	10%	6%	1%	83%
	Challenging Content	25%	47%	19%	5%	4%	72%
	Responsive Instructors	40%	34%	22%	1%	2%	73%
Overall	Recommend Program	24%	43%	18%	7%	7%	67%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	40%	25%	25%	5%	4%	65%
Brownsburg, IN		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>41 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	27%	54%	12%	5%	2%	80%
	Clear Content	66%	32%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	49%	49%		2%		98%
	Responsive Instructors	44%	39%	17%			83%
Overall	Recommend Program	46%	37%	10%	5%	2%	83%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	63%	30%	6%			94%

Table 18. Economic Issues for Teachers
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Scottsdale, AZ

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>22 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	86%	14%				100%
	Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
	Challenging Content	86%	14%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	91%	9%				100%
	Improve Teaching	91%	9%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Topics	Demise of Soviet Union	64%	27%	9%			91%
	Issues of International Trade	64%	32%	5%			95%
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor	64%	23%	14%			86%
	Economics of Water Use and the Environment	55%	27%	18%			82%
	Professor	77%	18%	5%			95%
	Mentor Teacher	82%	18%				100%
	Meeting Spaces	41%	27%	27%	5%		68%
	Food	32%	32%	32%	5%		64%

Table 19. FTE 2016 Program
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire

Overall

	Very Much	Some- what	Not at All	
<i>59 Participants</i>				
Enthusiasm for Teaching Increased	73%	22%	5%	
Confidence in Teaching Economics Increased	64%	32%	5%	
	Yes	No		Skipped
Have Used Program Materials in Classroom	90%	10%		
Will Teach Economics in the Near Future	100%			56
Plan to Use FTE Materials in Economics Class	100%			56
Have Recommended FTE Programs and Materials	83%	17%		
	Much Better	Better	No Difference	Not Applicable
My Students Have a Better Understanding	55%	38%	2%	6%