

Table 1. Economics for Leaders  
Pre-Post Test Results

	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Increase</b>
Houston, TX	<b>72%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>8%</b>
Boulder, CO	<b>70%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>4%</b>
New Haven, CT (1)	<b>72%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Los Angeles, CA	<b>68%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>8%</b>
Berkeley, CA (1)	<b>72%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>11%</b>
New Haven, CT (2)	<b>76%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>7%</b>
Berkeley, CA (2)	<b>68%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Williamsburg, VA	<b>77%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>2%</b>
Winston-Salem, NC	<b>70%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>6%</b>
Ithaca, NY	<b>77%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>6%</b>
St. Louis, MO	<b>70%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Providence, RI	<b>75%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>7%</b>
Oberlin, OH	<b>64%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>8%</b>
Seattle, WA	<b>68%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Overall Percent	<b>71%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>8%</b>

Table 2. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Overall</b>	<i>460 Participants</i>						
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	39%	47%	11%	3%		<b>86%</b>
	Clear Content	54%	40%	6%			<b>93%</b>
	Challenging Content	43%	44%	11%	1%		<b>87%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	62%	29%	7%	1%		<b>91%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	49%	35%	11%	4%	1%	<b>84%</b>
	Clear Content	48%	39%	9%	3%	1%	<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	62%	28%	9%	1%		<b>90%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	58%	32%	8%	2%	1%	<b>90%</b>
	Improve Understanding	43%	44%	9%	4%		<b>87%</b>

Table 2. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Houston, TX</b>							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	38%	50%	13%			<b>88%</b>
	Clear Content	56%	41%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	47%	44%	9%			<b>91%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	94%	3%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Clear Content	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	84%	13%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Improve Understanding	44%	44%	13%			<b>88%</b>
<b>Boulder, CO</b>							
<i>22 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	18%	41%	27%	9%	5%	<b>59%</b>
	Clear Content	18%	55%	27%			<b>73%</b>
	Challenging Content	9%	64%	23%	5%		<b>73%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	36%	36%	18%	9%		<b>73%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	59%	41%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	59%	41%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	77%	18%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	55%	27%	18%			<b>82%</b>
	Improve Understanding	9%	73%	9%	5%	5%	<b>82%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (1)</b>							
<i>34 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	41%	56%		3%		<b>97%</b>
	Clear Content	65%	26%	6%	3%		<b>91%</b>
	Challenging Content	38%	56%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	68%	32%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	24%	44%	21%	6%	6%	<b>68%</b>
	Clear Content	44%	38%	12%	3%	3%	<b>82%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	44%	44%	12%			<b>88%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	35%	44%	9%	6%	3%	<b>79%</b>
	Improve Understanding	47%	35%	6%	12%		<b>82%</b>
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	38%	54%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Clear Content	59%	38%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	57%	35%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	65%	35%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	38%	43%	14%	5%		<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	27%	65%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	65%	30%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	62%	35%	3%			<b>97%</b>

Table 2. Economics for Leaders  
Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Berkeley, CA (1)</b>							
<i>41 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	29%	51%	20%			<b>80%</b>
	Clear Content	56%	39%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Challenging Content	37%	39%	24%			<b>76%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	63%	29%	7%			<b>93%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	41%	34%	20%	5%		<b>76%</b>
	Clear Content	39%	41%	15%	5%		<b>80%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	54%	34%	10%	2%		<b>88%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	41%	34%	20%	5%		<b>76%</b>
	Improve Understanding	34%	46%	12%	7%		<b>80%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (2)</b>							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	30%	57%	11%	11%	3%	<b>86%</b>
	Clear Content	54%	35%	11%			<b>89%</b>
	Challenging Content	49%	43%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	54%	35%	11%			<b>89%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	57%	35%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
	Clear Content	57%	30%	11%	3%		<b>86%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	59%	35%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Improve Understanding	46%	41%	14%			<b>86%</b>
<b>Berkeley, CA (2)</b>							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	50%	11%	3%		<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	47%	45%	3%	3%	3%	<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	34%	55%	8%	3%		<b>89%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	50%	39%	8%	3%		<b>89%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	24%	34%	21%	13%	8%	<b>58%</b>
	Clear Content	26%	39%	13%	16%	5%	<b>66%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	29%	42%	21%	8%		<b>71%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	26%	50%	16%	3%	5%	<b>76%</b>
	Improve Understanding	50%	37%	8%	5%		<b>87%</b>
<b>Williamsburg, VA</b>							
<i>24 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	42%	42%	8%	8%		<b>83%</b>
	Clear Content	58%	38%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Challenging Content	29%	67%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	58%	38%	4%			<b>96%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	46%	46%	4%	4%		<b>92%</b>
	Clear Content	38%	58%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	46%	42%	8%		4%	<b>88%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	67%	25%	4%	4%		<b>92%</b>
	Improve Understanding	42%	42%	13%	4%		<b>83%</b>

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

Table 2. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Oberlin, OH</b>							
<i>24 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	54%	29%	17%			<b>83%</b>
	Clear Content	58%	42%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	42%	46%	8%			<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	83%	13%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	88%	13%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
	Improve Understanding	50%	38%	13%			<b>88%</b>
<b>Seattle, WA</b>							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	28%	53%	16%	3%		<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	38%	47%	16%			<b>84%</b>
	Challenging Content	34%	53%	6%	6%		<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	28%	28%	34%	6%	3%	<b>56%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	63%	34%		3%		<b>97%</b>
	Clear Content	84%	13%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	81%	16%	3%			<b>97%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	56%	38%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Improve Understanding	38%	50%	9%	9%		<b>88%</b>

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

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>460 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	51%	30%	16%	3%	3%	<b>81%</b>
Leadership Team	58%	30%	9%	2%	2%	<b>88%</b>
Program Coordinators	57%	28%	9%	5%	5%	<b>85%</b>
Residence Halls	24%	30%	25%	14%	4%	<b>54%</b>
Food	17%	23%	31%	22%	6%	<b>40%</b>
Recreational Activities	23%	30%	25%	12%	5%	<b>54%</b>

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

	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Houston, TX</b> <i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	54%	27%	18%	1%		<b>81%</b>
Leadership Team	69%	31%				<b>100%</b>
Program Coordinators	97%	3%				<b>100%</b>
Residence Halls	53%	41%	6%			<b>94%</b>
Food	41%	34%	22%	3%		<b>75%</b>
Recreational Activities	44%	25%	28%	3%		<b>69%</b>
<b>Boulder, CO</b> <i>22 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	16%	48%	23%	11%	2%	<b>64%</b>
Leadership Team	73%	27%				<b>100%</b>
Program Coordinators	41%	41%	5%	9%	5%	<b>82%</b>
Residence Halls	9%	55%	27%	9%		<b>64%</b>
Food	36%	55%		5%	5%	<b>91%</b>
Recreational Activities	50%	41%		5%		<b>91%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (1)</b> <i>34 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	26%	15%			<b>85%</b>
Leadership Team	41%	41%	18%			<b>82%</b>
Program Coordinators	24%	35%	26%	15%		<b>59%</b>
Residence Halls	6%	9%	24%	35%	26%	<b>15%</b>
Food	18%	12%	26%	29%	12%	<b>29%</b>
Recreational Activities	15%	29%	35%	18%	3%	<b>44%</b>
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b> <i>37 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	32%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Leadership Team	35%	46%	19%			<b>81%</b>
Program Coordinators	49%	46%	5%			<b>95%</b>
Residence Halls	14%	24%	35%	27%		<b>38%</b>
Food	30%	35%	30%	5%		<b>65%</b>
Recreational Activities	38%	41%	16%	5%		<b>78%</b>



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

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

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

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

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

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

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>						
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	69%	27%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Clear Content	83%	14%	2%	1%		<b>97%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	25%	1%	1%		<b>96%</b>
	Clear Content	82%	14%	3%	1%		<b>96%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	90%	9%	1%			<b>99%</b>
	Challenging Content	74%	24%		2%		<b>98%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	86%	10%		2%	2%	<b>96%</b>

Table 4. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Houston, TX</b>							
<i>10 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	90%	10%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	90%				10%	<b>90%</b>
<b>Boulder, CO</b>							
<i>13 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	62%	23%	15%			<b>85%</b>
	Clear Content	69%	15%	8%	8%		<b>85%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	62%	15%		8%		<b>77%</b>
	Clear Content	69%	15%	8%	8%		<b>85%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	77%	15%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	69%	15%		15%		<b>85%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	85%	8%		8%		<b>92%</b>
<b>Williamsburg, VA</b>							
<i>10 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	80%	10%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Clear Content	100%					<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	10%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	100%					<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Winston-Salem, NC</b>							
<i>18 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	72%	22%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Clear Content	89%	11%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	65%	35%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	78%	11%		6%	6%	<b>89%</b>

Table 4. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>							
<i>10 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	90%	10%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Oberlin, OH</b>							
<i>18 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	72%	28%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	89%	11%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	94%	6%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	100%					<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	100%					<b>100%</b>
<b>Seattle, WA</b>							
<i>14 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	57%	43%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	71%	21%	7%			<b>93%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	79%	14%	7%			<b>93%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	79%	21%				<b>100%</b>

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 6. Economic History for Leaders (Tufts University)

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

**Medford, MA**

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

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
48%	64%	16%

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

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

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

**Scottsdale, AZ**

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

Table 9. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

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

Table 9. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Lynchburg, VA**

		<b>Strongly</b>			<b>Strongly</b>		
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	25 <i>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%
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	52%	36%	12%			88%
	Program Site	68%	20%	12%			88%
	Food	68%	20%	12%			88%

**Miami, FL**

		<b>Strongly</b>			<b>Strongly</b>		
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	6 <i>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%
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	83%	17%				100%
	Program Site	33%		50%	17%		33%
	Food	50%	33%	17%			83%

**Long Beach, CA**

		<b>Strongly</b>			<b>Strongly</b>		
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	7 <i>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%
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	71%	14%	14%			86%
	Program Site	14%	29%	43%	14%		43%
	Food	43%	43%	14%			86%



Table 9. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Weehawken, NJ**

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

**Orange City, IA**

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

**Boise, ID**

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

Table 9. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**St. Cloud, MN**

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

Table 10. Issues of International Trade  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Toronto, ON**

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

Table 11. Economic Forces in American History  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Denver, CO**

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

Table 12. Teacher Economics: Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
Teacher Evaluations

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

Table 12. Teacher Economics: Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
Teacher Evaluations

**Sterling Heights, MI**

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

**San Jose, CA**

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

**Springdale, AR**

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

Table 13. Economics of Disasters (EOD)  
Teacher Evaluations

**Mississauga, Canada**

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

**Burnaby, BC**

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

Table 14. 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%	<b>80%</b>
	Clear Content	56%	36%	6%			<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	42%	10%	6%	1%	1%	<b>52%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	52%	16%	16%	1%	1%	<b>68%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	36%	18%	18%	3%	3%	<b>55%</b>
	Improve Understanding	26%	30%	4%			<b>56%</b>
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Instructor Overall	50%	33%	13%	1%		<b>83%</b>
	Meeting Space	30%	17%	9%			<b>47%</b>
	Food	32%	9%	6%	6%	6%	<b>41%</b>



Table 14. World of Economics  
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, 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>
<b>Denver, CO</b>							
	<i>61 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	10%	59%	31%			<b>69%</b>
	Clear Content	51%	39%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Challenging Content	34%	51%	13%		2%	<b>85%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	56%	44%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	23%	44%	30%	2%	2%	<b>67%</b>
	Improve Understanding	31%	57%	8%	2%	2%	<b>89%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	51%	39%	7%	2%	1%	<b>90%</b>
	Meeting Space	69%	30%	2%			<b>98%</b>
	Food	79%	13%	8%			<b>92%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Fort Wayne, IN</b>							
	<i>68 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	34%	51%	13%	1%		<b>85%</b>
	Clear Content	76%	24%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	59%	38%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	59%	32%	32%			<b>91%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	49%	31%	19%	1%		<b>79%</b>
	Improve Understanding	56%	40%	4%			<b>96%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	57%	33%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Meeting Space	59%	26%	9%	6%		<b>85%</b>
	Food	46%	22%	19%	12%	1%	<b>68%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Alexandria, VA</b>							
	<i>62 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	48%	39%	11%	2%		<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	48%	45%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Challenging Content	48%	39%	11%	2%		<b>87%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	61%	32%	6%			<b>94%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	45%	42%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Improve Understanding	40%	50%	10%			<b>90%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	48%	36%	12%	4%		<b>84%</b>
	Meeting Space	23%	27%	34%	13%	2%	<b>50%</b>
	Food	38%	6%		25%	31%	<b>44%</b>

Table 14. World of Economics  
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

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

Table 15. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online (EDSUO)  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

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

Table 16. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT)  
Teacher Evaluations

**Overall**

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

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

**EOFT-1 Fall 2016**

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

**EOFT-2 Fall 2016**

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

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

**EOFT-1 Spring 2017**

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

**EOFT-2 Spring 2017**

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

Table 17. Economics History Online for Teachers (EHOFT Part 1)  
Teacher Evaluations

**EHOFT Part 1**

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

Table 18. Teacher Economics: The Federal Reserve System (TE - FR)  
Teacher Evaluations

**TE - FR Fall 2016**

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

**TE - FR Spring 2017**

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



Table 19. Economics of Disasters Online (EODO)  
Teacher Evaluations

**EODO Winter 2017**

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

Table 20. FTE 2016 Program  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire

**Overall**

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