

Table 1. Economics for Leaders
Pre-Post Test Results

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Increase
Houston, TX	71%	80%	10%
New Haven, CT (1)	72%	80%	7%
Los Angeles, CA	73%	83%	10%
New Haven, CT (2)	80%	88%	9%
Berkeley, CA	77%	88%	11%
Boston, MA	76%	80%	4%
Winston-Salem, NC	72%	81%	9%
Dallas, TX	61%	73%	11%
St. Louis, MO	72%	82%	10%
Atlanta, GA	68%	81%	12%
Ithaca, NY	72%	85%	13%
Providence, RI (1)	72%	82%	11%
Cleveland, OH	65%	71%	7%
Santa Barbara, CA	73%	82%	10%
Providence, RI (2)	74%	82%	8%
Ann Arbor, MI	73%	84%	11%
Overall Percent	72%	81%	9%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Overall	<i>603 Respondents</i>						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	35%	48%	13%	4%	1%	83%
	Clear Content	53%	38%	7%	1%		91%
	Challenging Content	41%	44%	13%	2%	1%	85%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	29%	5%	1%	1%	94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	45%	38%	12%	3%	2%	83%
	Clear Content	46%	37%	12%	4%	1%	83%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	29%	6%	2%		92%
Overall	Recommend Program	48%	43%	8%	1%		90%
	Improve Understanding	44%	43%	13%	1%		86%

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>31 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	20%	43%	23%	13%		63%
	Clear Content	37%	43%	13%	3%	3%	80%
	Challenging Content	30%	40%	17%	7%	7%	70%
	Responsive Instructors	50%	20%	7%	7%	17%	70%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	60%	33%	3%		3%	93%
	Clear Content	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	17%	7%			93%
Overall	Recommend Program	47%	47%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	23%	50%	23%		3%	73%
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
New Haven, CT (1)							
<i>46 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	25%	45%	25%	5%		70%
	Clear Content	36%	52%	9%	2%		89%
	Challenging Content	25%	43%	20%	9%	2%	68%
	Responsive Instructors	45%	43%	11%			89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	34%	11%	5%		84%
	Clear Content	41%	43%	16%			84%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	32%	7%			93%
Overall	Recommend Program	36%	55%	7%	2%		91%
	Improve Understanding	34%	39%	25%	2%		73%
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Los Angeles, CA							
<i>43 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	37%	56%	5%	2%		93%
	Clear Content	60%	40%				100%
	Challenging Content	47%	44%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	21%	2%	2%		95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	33%	51%	12%	5%		84%
	Clear Content	30%	44%	21%	5%		74%
	Responsive Instructors	42%	49%	7%	2%		91%
Overall	Recommend Program	42%	51%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	42%	51%	7%			93%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
New Haven, CT (2)							
<i>45 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	39%	45%	11%	5%		84%
	Clear Content	52%	36%	11%			89%
	Challenging Content	43%	43%	9%	5%		86%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	27%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	27%	39%	23%	9%	2%	66%
	Clear Content	43%	27%	16%	11%	2%	70%
	Responsive Instructors	39%	32%	18%	9%	2%	70%
Overall	Recommend Program	34%	41%	23%	2%		75%
	Improve Understanding	43%	45%	9%	2%		89%
Berkeley, CA							
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	23%	57%	14%	6%		80%
	Clear Content	26%	49%	17%	6%	3%	74%
	Challenging Content	26%	49%	26%			74%
	Responsive Instructors	26%	63%	11%			89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	43%	43%	14%			86%
	Clear Content	37%	54%	6%	3%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	54%	40%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	29%	54%	11%	6%		83%
	Improve Understanding	37%	51%	11%			89%
Boston, MA							
<i>37 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	42%	50%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	69%	22%	6%	3%		92%
	Challenging Content	44%	42%	14%			86%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	14%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	22%	39%	22%	8%	8%	61%
	Clear Content	19%	42%	17%	17%	6%	61%
	Responsive Instructors	42%	39%	17%	3%		81%
Overall	Recommend Program	39%	42%	11%	6%	3%	81%
	Improve Understanding	53%	39%	8%			92%

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 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	41%	50%	6%		3%	91%
	Clear Content	62%	35%			3%	97%
	Challenging Content	53%	44%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	24%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	68%	29%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	70%	30%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	21%	3%	3%		94%
Overall	Recommend Program	74%	26%				100%
	Improve Understanding	65%	32%	3%			97%
Dallas, TX							
<i>36 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	29%	50%	9%	6%	6%	79%
	Clear Content	38%	47%	9%	6%		85%
	Challenging Content	35%	38%	26%			74%
	Responsive Instructors	44%	44%	12%			88%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	41%	41%	18%			82%
	Clear Content	39%	45%	12%	3%		85%
	Responsive Instructors	53%	35%	9%	3%		88%
Overall	Recommend Program	47%	47%	3%	3%		94%
	Improve Understanding	29%	47%	21%	3%		76%
St. Louis, MO							
<i>32 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	45%	48%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	61%	23%	16%			84%
	Challenging Content	39%	52%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	39%	52%	10%			90%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	58%	32%	3%	6%		90%
	Clear Content	52%	32%	13%	3%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	16%	6%	3%		90%
Overall	Recommend Program	61%	35%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	48%	45%	6%			94%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Atlanta, GA							
<i>31 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	30%	53%	17%			83%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	43%	43%	13%			87%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	17%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	27%	13%	7%	3%	77%
	Clear Content	50%	37%	7%	3%	3%	87%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	27%	7%			93%
Overall	Recommend Program	37%	60%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	53%	33%	13%			87%
Ithaca, NY							
<i>42 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	33%	57%	7%	2%		90%
	Clear Content	57%	38%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	38%	55%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	24%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	52%	38%	10%			90%
	Clear Content	52%	45%	2%			98%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	33%	2%			98%
Overall	Recommend Program	67%	26%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	40%	43%	14%	2%		83%
Providence, RI (1)							
<i>37 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	41%	43%	14%	3%		84%
	Clear Content	50%	50%				100%
	Challenging Content	38%	57%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	46%	41%	8%		5%	86%
	Clear Content	32%	43%	16%	5%	3%	76%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	54%	41%	5%			95%
	Improve Understanding	35%	57%	8%			92%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Cleveland, OH							
<i>27 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	26%	52%	22%			78%
	Clear Content	30%	56%	15%			85%
	Challenging Content	33%	33%	30%	4%		67%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	30%	4%			96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	78%	11%	11%			89%
	Clear Content	78%	19%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	74%	26%				100%
	Improve Understanding	44%	44%	11%			89%
Santa Barbara, CA							
<i>45 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	41%	32%	20%	7%		73%
	Clear Content	64%	32%	2%	2%		95%
	Challenging Content	43%	48%	5%	5%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	30%	2%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	34%	50%	14%	2%		84%
	Clear Content	48%	39%	14%			86%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	50%	41%	7%	2%		91%
	Improve Understanding	55%	34%	9%	2%		89%
Providence, RI (2)							
<i>38 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	37%	47%	5%	8%	3%	84%
	Clear Content	66%	29%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	53%	42%		5%		95%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	16%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	32%	55%	8%	5%		87%
	Clear Content	29%	47%	24%			76%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	34%	5%			95%
Overall	Recommend Program	45%	45%	11%			89%
	Improve Understanding	47%	42%	11%			89%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Ann Arbor, MI							
<i>44 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	50%	36%	9%	2%	2%	86%
	Clear Content	70%	23%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	59%	25%	16%			84%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	14%	2%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	52%	27%	14%	5%	2%	80%
	Clear Content	59%	20%	11%	9%		80%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	14%	7%	2%		91%
Overall	Recommend Program	43%	41%	16%			84%
	Improve Understanding	50%	32%	18%			82%

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

Overall	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>603 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	52%	31%	13%	4%	1%	83%
Leadership Team	55%	28%	11%	4%	4%	82%
Program Coordinators	61%	25%	11%	3%	1%	86%
Residence Halls	15%	29%	32%	19%	5%	44%
Food	14%	21%	30%	25%	10%	35%
Recreational Activities	24%	36%	29%	10%	1%	60%

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

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Houston, TX						
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	25%	25%	29%	13%	8%	50%
Leadership Team	71%	29%				100%
Program Coordinators	74%	21%	1%	2%	1%	96%
Residence Halls	14%	36%	50%			50%
Food	14%	41%	36%	9%		55%
Recreational Activities	14%	43%	38%	5%		57%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
New Haven, CT (1)						
<i>46 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	38%	38%	21%	2%		76%
Leadership Team	58%	24%	12%	6%		82%
Program Coordinators	60%	24%	11%	5%	1%	84%
Residence Halls	16%	30%	34%	14%	7%	45%
Food	23%	25%	30%	18%	5%	48%
Recreational Activities	39%	41%	16%	5%		80%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Los Angeles, CA						
<i>43 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	53%	37%	9%			91%
Leadership Team	33%	37%	16%	14%		70%
Program Coordinators	66%	24%	6%	2%	1%	90%
Residence Halls	16%	21%	44%	16%	2%	37%
Food	19%	37%	26%	16%	2%	56%
Recreational Activities	33%	47%	21%			79%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
New Haven, CT (2)						
<i>45 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	65%	23%	9%	2%		88%
Leadership Team	44%	23%	14%	12%	7%	67%
Program Coordinators	58%	24%	15%	2%	1%	82%
Residence Halls	3%	21%	34%	37%	5%	24%
Food	5%	8%	21%	45%	21%	13%
Recreational Activities	8%	46%	41%	5%		54%

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

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Berkeley, CA						
<i>35 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	20%	34%	34%	11%		54%
Leadership Team	43%	31%	26%			74%
Program Coordinators	51%	31%	17%	1%		81%
Residence Halls	3%	26%	51%	14%	6%	29%
Food			29%	40%	31%	0%
Recreational Activities	15%	27%	48%	9%		42%
Boston, MA						
<i>37 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	57%	34%	6%	3%		91%
Leadership Team	14%	23%	26%	14%	23%	37%
Program Coordinators	51%	24%	17%	4%	3%	76%
Residence Halls	9%	21%	21%	32%	18%	29%
Food	15%	29%	35%	18%	3%	44%
Recreational Activities	24%	33%	33%	9%		58%
Winston-Salem, NC						
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	75%	19%	6%			94%
Leadership Team	94%	6%				100%
Program Coordinators	88%	12%				100%
Residence Halls	6%	12%	29%	47%	6%	18%
Food	44%	24%	29%	3%		68%
Recreational Activities	65%	26%	6%	3%		91%
Dallas, TX						
<i>36 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	25%	55%	13%	7%		80%
Leadership Team	43%	40%	13%	3%		83%
Program Coordinators	61%	29%	9%	1%		90%
Residence Halls	38%	24%	34%	3%		62%
Food	14%	24%	38%	21%	3%	38%
Recreational Activities	11%	22%	30%	30%	7%	33%

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

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
St. Louis, MO						
<i>32 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	47%	29%	19%	3%	2%	76%
Leadership Team	48%	29%	6%	6%	10%	77%
Program Coordinators	57%	25%	11%	7%	1%	82%
Residence Halls	38%	52%	7%	3%		90%
Food	3%	33%	50%	10%	3%	37%
Recreational Activities	13%	37%	27%	23%		50%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Atlanta, GA						
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	55%	38%	2%	5%		93%
Leadership Team	72%	21%	3%	3%		93%
Program Coordinators	54%	31%	12%	2%		86%
Residence Halls	23%	43%	30%	3%		67%
Food	10%	10%	37%	37%	7%	20%
Recreational Activities	30%	20%	33%	13%	3%	50%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Ithaca, NY						
<i>42 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	67%	29%	5%			95%
Leadership Team	69%	26%	5%			95%
Program Coordinators	57%	26%	17%	1%		83%
Residence Halls	20%	40%	30%	10%		60%
Food	13%	38%	28%	20%	3%	50%
Recreational Activities	16%	41%	35%	5%	3%	57%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Providence, RI (1)						
<i>37 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	54%	32%	14%			86%
Leadership Team	43%	41%	16%			84%
Program Coordinators	55%	33%	10%	3%		88%
Residence Halls	11%	22%	49%	19%		32%
Food		24%	35%	38%	3%	24%
Recreational Activities	25%	36%	31%	8%		61%

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

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Cleveland, OH <i>27 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	44%	17%	24%	15%		61%
Leadership Team	96%	4%				100%
Program Coordinators	84%	10%	5%		1%	94%
Residence Halls	4%	7%	11%	41%	37%	11%
Food			22%	44%	33%	0%
Recreational Activities	26%	26%	26%	15%	7%	52%
Santa Barbara, CA <i>45 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	68%	23%	9%			91%
Leadership Team	59%	36%	5%			95%
Program Coordinators	66%	24%	6%	2%	1%	90%
Residence Halls	18%	45%	23%	14%		64%
Food	43%	27%	23%	5%	2%	70%
Recreational Activities	47%	37%	12%	5%		84%
Providence, RI (2) <i>38 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	58%	29%	11%	3%		87%
Leadership Team	39%	45%	16%			84%
Program Coordinators	50%	36%	14%			86%
Residence Halls	3%	21%	34%	37%	5%	24%
Food	5%	8%	21%	45%	21%	13%
Recreational Activities	8%	46%	41%	5%		54%
Ann Arbor, MI <i>44 Respondents</i>						
Economics Team	66%	25%	7%	2%		91%
Leadership Team	66%	20%	7%	7%		86%
Program Coordinators	51%	25%	15%	9%	1%	76%
Residence Halls	25%	39%	23%	11%	2%	64%
Food	5%	7%	25%	34%	30%	11%
Recreational Activities	14%	37%	28%	19%	2%	51%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Overall	<i>75 Respondents</i>						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	44%	37%	15%	4%		81%
	Clear Content	64%	32%	1%	3%		96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	59%	37%	3%	2%		96%
	Clear Content	68%	27%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	21%	1%			99%
	Challenging Content	64%	28%	7%	1%		92%
Overall	Recommend Program	72%	26%	3%			97%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Winston-Salem, NC							
<i>22 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	45%	36%	14%	5%		82%
	Clear Content	77%	23%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	73%	23%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	73%	18%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	10%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	59%	36%	5%			95%
Overall	Recommend Program	73%	23%	5%			95%
Dallas, TX							
<i>11 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	36%	64%				100%
	Clear Content	55%	36%		9%		91%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	73%	27%				100%
	Clear Content	73%	18%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	36%				100%
	Challenging Content	64%	18%	9%	9%		82%
Overall	Recommend Program	70%	30%				100%
St. Louis, MO							
<i>9 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
	Clear Content	89%			11%		89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	38%		13%		88%
	Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	100%					100%
Overall	Recommend Program	100%					100%
Atlanta, GA							
<i>18 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	28%	33%	28%	11%		61%
	Clear Content	56%	44%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	44%	56%				100%
	Clear Content	61%	39%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	28%				100%
	Challenging Content	61%	28%	11%			89%
Overall	Recommend Program	67%	28%	6%			94%

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Cleveland, OH							
<i>15 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	36%	43%	21%			79%
	Clear Content	47%	47%	7%			93%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	53%	40%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	53%	40%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	53%	40%	7%			93%
Overall	Recommend Program	60%	40%				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>75 Participants</i>						
Professors	70%	20%	8%	1%		90%
Mentor Teachers	69%	20%	11%			89%
Program Components						
Lectures	53%	27%	19%	1%		80%
Activities	56%	35%	8%	1%		91%
Overall	42%	28%	24%	5%		71%
Residence Halls	7%	23%	25%	31%	14%	30%
Food	27%	23%	31%	15%	4%	50%
Recreational Activities	23%	26%	29%	17%	5%	49%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit	57%	41%	3%	

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

Winston-Salem, NC	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>22 Respondents</i>						
Scott Baier	76%	14%	10%			90%
Tom Lampe	71%	14%	14%			86%
Program Components						
Lectures	59%	27%	14%			86%
Activities	55%	36%	5%	5%		91%
Overall	50%	27%	18%	5%		77%
Residence Halls	11%	6%	6%	44%	33%	17%
Food	38%	14%	33%	14%		52%
Recreational Activities	25%	17%	33%	17%	5%	42%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 64%	32%	5%		
Dallas, TX	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Dan Benjamin	60%	20%	20%			80%
Malhaz Jibladze	90%	10%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	55%	9%	36%			64%
Activities	82%	18%				100%
Overall	45%	27%	27%			73%
Residence Halls		43%	43%	14%		43%
Food	18%	36%	45%			55%
Recreational Activities	67%		33%			67%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 60%	40%			

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>9 Respondents</i>						
Roger Butters	100%					100%
Tom Rooney	100%					100%
Program Components						
Lectures	100%					100%
Activities	100%					100%
Overall	75%	25%				100%
Residence Halls	33%	50%	17%			83%
Food		33%	44%	22%		33%
Recreational Activities		67%	33%			67%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		67%	33%			
Atlanta, GA	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>18 Respondents</i>						
Scott Baier	56%	33%	6%	6%		89%
Tom Lampe	50%	39%	11%			89%
Program Components						
Lectures	28%	50%	17%	6%		78%
Activities	39%	56%	6%			94%
Overall	39%	33%	22%	6%		72%
Residence Halls		13%	33%	47%	7%	13%
Food	56%	22%	17%		6%	78%
Recreational Activities	9%	27%	27%	36%		36%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		56%	39%	6%		

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

Cleveland, OH	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>15 Respondents</i>						
Don Fell	67%	27%	7%			93%
Eric Fields	53%	27%	20%			80%
Program Components						
Lectures	47%	27%	27%			73%
Activities	33%	40%	27%			73%
Overall	13%	27%	47%	13%		40%
Residence Halls		29%	36%	21%	14%	29%
Food		20%	25%	40%	13%	20%
Recreational Activities	17%	33%	17%	17%	17%	50%
			Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		Quite a Bit 40%	60%			

Table 6. Economic History for Leaders

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

Berkeley, CA

		Strongly			Strongly		
<i>34 Respondents</i>		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Morning	Stimulated Interest	21%	62%	9%	9%		82%
	Clear Content	50%	38%	12%			88%
	Challenging Content	26%	47%	24%			74%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	26%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	44%	47%	6%	3%		91%
	Clear Content	62%	35%			3%	97%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	24%	3%	3%	3%	91%
Overall	Recommend Program	32%	59%	6%	3%		91%
	Improve Understanding	38%	50%	9%	3%		88%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team		43%	29%	19%	7%	1%	72%
Leadership Program		53%	38%	6%	3%		91%
Program Coordinators		57%	37%	5%		1%	94%
Residence Halls		9%	24%	41%	21%	6%	32%
Food			3%	24%	24%	50%	3%
Recreational Activities		33%	30%	6%	6%	3%	64%
Pre- and Post-test Results							
		Pre-test	Post-test	Gain			
		45%	59%	14%			

Table 7. Economic Force In American History
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Berkeley, CA		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>13 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	77%	23%				100%
	Clear Content	85%	15%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	85%	15%				100%
	Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
	Challenging Content	62%	38%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	100%					100%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Professor	85%	15%				100%
	Mentor Teacher	100%					100%
	Program Components						
	Lectures	85%	8%	8%			92%
	Activities	100%					100%
	Overall	85%	15%				100%
	Residence Halls	15%	38%	31%	15%		54%
	Food		31%	54%	15%		31%
	Recreational Activities	29%	43%	29%			71%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No			
	Changed Understanding	62%	38%				
New York, NY		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>18 Respondents</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	76%	24%				100%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
	Challenging Content	65%	35%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
	Professor	85%	15%				100%
	Mentor Teacher	88%	12%				100%
	Program Components						
	Lectures	76%	24%				100%
	Activities	65%	29%	6%			94%
	Overall	82%	18%				100%
							0%
	Food	24%	29%	35%	12%		53%
	Classroom Facilities	24%	59%	18%			82%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No			
	Changed Understanding	65%	35%				

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

Ft. Lauderdale, FL

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>21 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
Clear Content	100%					100%
Challenging Content	100%					100%
Responsive Instructors	95%	5%				100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	95%	5%				100%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	90%	5%	5%			95%
Meeting Space	52%	33%	14%			86%
Food	52%	38%	5%	5%		90%

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

Overall						Strongly	
<i>162 Respondents</i>		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	SA+A
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	66%	31%	3%	1%		96%
	Clear Content	73%	25%	2%	1%		98%
	Challenging Content	67%	30%	2%			98%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	21%	1%	1%		98%
	Recommend Program	72%	24%	2%	1%		96%
	Improve Teaching	59%	32%	8%	1%		91%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	69%	22%	7%	2%		91%
	Program Site	37%	34%	26%	2%		71%
	Food	29%	30%	31%	6%	2%	59%

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

St. Charles, MO

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	66%	29%	3%	3%		94%
	Clear Content	60%	37%		3%		97%
	Challenging Content	54%	43%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	69%	29%	3%			97%
	Recommend Program	63%	26%	9%			89%
	Improve Teaching	46%	34%	17%	3%		80%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	60%	31%	6%	3%		91%
	Program Site	54%	37%	9%			91%
	Food	46%	34%	11%			80%

Wilmington, NC

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>36 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	69%	26%	6%			95%
	Clear Content	81%	14%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	75%	19%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	17%		3%		97%
	Recommend Program	71%	26%		3%		97%
	Improve Teaching	64%	28%	6%	3%		92%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	83%	8%	6%	3%		92%
	Program Site	14%	31%	56%			44%
	Food	11%	19%	50%	8%	8%	31%

Richmond, VA

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	58%	37%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	74%	21%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	63%	37%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	32%				100%
	Recommend Program	74%	21%	5%			95%
	Improve Teaching	58%	37%	5%			95%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	68%	16%	16%			84%
	Program Site	63%	37%				100%
	Food	42%	53%	5%			95%

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

Beebe, AR

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>9 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	89%	11%				100%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	100%					100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Improve Teaching	89%	11%				100%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	89%	11%				100%
	Program Site	67%	33%				100%
	Food	78%	11%		11%		89%

Marquette, MI

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>21 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	57%	38%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
	Recommend Program	57%	38%		5%		95%
	Improve Teaching	43%	43%	14%			86%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	71%	29%				100%
	Program Site	10%	33%	33%	19%	5%	43%
	Food	10%	14%	57%	14%	5%	24%

Colorado Springs, CO

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>42 Respondents</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
	Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	31%	2%			98%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	21%	2%			98%
	Recommend Program	81%	19%				100%
	Improve Teaching	67%	31%	2%			98%
		Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall	Instructor	58%	27%	11%	4%		86%
	Program Site	37%	34%	29%			71%
	Food	24%	36%	36%	5%		60%

Table 10. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Birmingham, AL

<i>19 Respondents</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	50%	33%	17%			83%
Clear Content	44%	44%	11%			89%
Challenging Content	39%	50%	11%			89%
Responsive Instructors	61%	33%	6%			94%
Recommend Course	67%	17%	17%			83%
Improve Teaching	56%	28%	11%	6%		83%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	61%	22%	6%	11%		83%
Meeting Space	79%	16%	5%			95%
Food	72%	22%	6%			94%

Table 11. Understanding Global Economic Issues
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>80 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	86%	13%	1%			99%
Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Challenging Content	84%	15%	1%			99%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	88%	13%				100%
Improve Teaching	78%	19%	4%			96%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	76%	23%	1%			99%
Meeting Space	56%	24%	19%	1%		80%
Food	38%	28%	24%	6%	1%	65%

Table 11. Understanding Global Economic Issues
Teacher Evaluations

Jackson, MS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
Challenging Content	79%	21%				100%
Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
Recommend Course	89%	11%				100%
Improve Teaching	63%	21%	16%			84%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	74%	26%				100%
Meeting Space	58%	26%	16%			84%
Food	5%	26%	47%	16%	5%	32%

Boise, ID

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>12 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	92%	8%				100%
Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
Challenging Content	83%	17%				100%
Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	92%	8%				100%
Improve Teaching	75%	25%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	67%	33%				100%
Meeting Space	67%	25%	8%			92%
Food	50%	42%	8%			92%

Omaha, NE

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	82%	18%				100%
Clear Content	88%	12%				100%
Challenging Content	88%	12%				100%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	88%	12%				100%
Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	65%	29%	6%			94%
Meeting Space	53%	24%	18%	6%		76%
Food	24%	18%	35%	12%		41%

Table 11. Understanding Global Economic Issues
Teacher Evaluations

St. Cloud, MN

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>6 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	67%	17%	17%			83%
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
Challenging Content	67%	17%	17%			83%
Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
Recommend Course	83%	17%				100%
Improve Teaching	67%	33%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	67%	33%				100%
Meeting Space	33%	50%	17%			83%
Food	83%	17%				100%

Fairfax, VA

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>14 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	93%	7%				100%
Clear Content	79%	21%				100%
Challenging Content	86%	14%				100%
Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
Recommend Course	86%	14%				100%
Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	86%	14%				100%
Meeting Space	64%	21%	14%			86%
Food	64%	29%	7%			93%

Starkville, MS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>12 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
Clear Content	100%					100%
Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%
Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	83%	17%				100%
Improve Teaching	83%	17%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	100%					100%
Meeting Space	50%	8%	42%			58%
Food	42%	33%	17%			75%

Table 12. Issues of International Trade
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>115 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	68%	28%	1%			96%
Clear Content	81%	19%				100%
Challenging Content	76%	24%				100%
Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
Recommend Course	78%	21%	1%			99%
Improve Teaching	70%	28%	2%			98%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	79%	17%	4%			96%
Mentor Teacher	77%	19%	5%			95%
Economist	39%	26%	23%	9%	2%	65%
Meeting Space	41%	25%	30%	4%		66%
Food	25%	39%	17%			64%

Table 12. Issues of International Trade
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

New York, NY (1)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>22 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	82%	18%				100%
Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
Challenging Content	95%	5%				100%
Responsive Instructors	95%	5%				100%
Recommend Course	91%	9%				100%
Improve Teaching	77%	23%				100%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	90%	10%				100%
Mentor Teacher	73%	27%				100%
Economist	55%	18%	18%			73%
Meeting Space	32%	36%	32%			68%
Food						0%

San Mateo, CA

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>14 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
Clear Content	79%	21%				100%
Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Recommend Course	93%	7%				100%
Improve Teaching	79%	21%				100%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	71%	21%	7%			93%
Mentor Teacher	93%	7%				100%
Economist	71%	29%				100%
Meeting Space	43%	50%	7%			93%
Food	21%	50%	29%			71%

Table 12. Issues of International Trade
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Charlotte, NC

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	48%	38%	3%			86%
Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Recommend Course	62%	35%	3%			97%
Improve Teaching	59%	38%	3%			97%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	74%	24%	3%			97%
Mentor Teacher						
Economist	26%	35%	26%	12%		62%
Meeting Space	76%	21%	3%			97%
Food	47%	44%	9%			91%

San Jose, CA

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	74%	26%				100%
Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
Challenging Content	68%	32%				100%
Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Recommend Course	74%	26%				100%
Improve Teaching	79%	16%	5%			95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	79%	16%	5%			95%
Mentor Teacher	84%	5%	11%			89%
Economist	11%	16%	32%	32%	11%	26%
Meeting Space	37%	16%	47%			53%
Food	28%	39%	33%			67%

Table 12. Issues of International Trade
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

New York, NY (2)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
<i>26 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	73%	27%				100%
Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
Challenging Content	73%	27%				100%
Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Recommend Course	85%	15%				100%
Improve Teaching	69%	31%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	
Instructor Overall	80%	12%	8%			92%
Mentor Teacher	65%	27%	8%			92%
Economist	46%	27%	27%			73%
Meeting Space	4%	16%	64%	16%		20%
Food	19%	58%	23%			77%

Table 13. Economics, Entrepreneurship, and Environmentalism Online (EEEE)
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	53%	47%				100%
Clear Content	42%	53%	5%			95%
Challenging Content	26%	53%	5%	16%		79%
Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Overall Recommend Program	21%	68%	5%	5%		89%
Improve Teaching	63%	32%	5%			95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professor	89%	11%				100%
Program Components						
Lectures	21%	26%	47%		5%	47%
Activities	21%	42%	11%	11%		63%
Materials	11%	68%	16%	5%		79%
Assignments		63%	32%	5%		63%
Discussion	21%	53%	21%	5%		74%

Table 14. Economics of Disasters Online (EODO)
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

EODO Spring 2019

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
Clear Content	40%	60%				100%
Challenging Content	47%	47%		7%		93%
Responsive Instructors	87%	7%	7%			93%
Timely Return of Assignments	80%	13%	7%			93%
Recommend Course	47%	40%	13%			87%
Improve Teaching	73%	27%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	40%	60%				100%
Lectures	7%	60%	20%	13%		67%
Activities	13%	67%	20%			80%
Assignments	7%	60%	27%	7%		67%
Materials	13%	67%	20%			80%
Discussion Boards		53%	40%	7%		53%

Table 15. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT)
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
Clear Content	60%	33%	7%			93%
Challenging Content	80%	20%	20%			100%
Responsive Instructors	87%	7%	7%			93%
Timely Return of Assignments	93%	7%	7%			100%
Recommend Course	53%	40%	40%			93%
Improve Teaching	53%	40%		27%		93%
	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	67%	27%	7%			93%
Lectures	33%	40%	27%			73%
Activities	47%	33%	27%			80%
Assignments	20%	53%	20%			73%
Materials	27%	53%	20%			80%
Discussion Boards	33%	40%	20%			73%

Table 15. Economics Online for Teachers (EOFT Part 1 and 2)
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

EOFT-1 Fall 2018

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

EOFT-2 Winter 2019

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

Table 16. Economic History Online for Teachers
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

EHOFT Part 1 Spring 2019

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

Table 17. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online (EDSUO)
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

EDSUO

<i>17 Respondents</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Stimulated Interest	76%	24%				100%
Clear Content	65%	35%				100%
Challenging Content	65%	29%	6%			94%
Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	53%	47%				100%
Improve Teaching	71%	29%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	59%	35%	6%			94%
Lectures	24%	41%	35%			65%
Activities	29%	41%	29%			71%
Assignments	25%	38%	38%			63%
Materials	29%	47%	24%			76%
Discussion Boards	19%	44%	38%			63%

Table 18. FTE 2018 Program
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire

Overall

	Very Much	Some- what	Not at All	
<i>83 Respondents</i>				
Enthusiasm for Teaching Increased	69%	30%	1%	
Confidence in Teaching Economics Increased	71%	28%	1%	
	Yes	No		Skipped
Have Used Program Materials in Classroom	92%	8%		
Will Teach Economics in the Near Future	67%	33%		80
Plan to Use FTE Materials in Economics Class	100%			81
Have Recommended FTE Programs and Materials	99%	1%		3
	Much Better	Better	No Difference	Not Applicable
My Students Have a Better Understanding	42%	49%	7%	3%