

Table 1. Economics for Leaders  
Pre-Post Test Results

	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Increase</b>
Houston, TX	<b>68%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>10%</b>
New Haven, CT (1)	<b>67%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Los Angeles, CA	<b>69%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Berkeley, CA (1)	<b>76%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>10%</b>
New Haven, CT (2)	<b>78%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Berkeley, CA (2)	<b>70%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Oberlin, OH	<b>66%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Winston-Salem, NC	<b>76%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Ithaca, NY	<b>71%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Providence, RI	<b>72%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>6%</b>
Santa Barbara, CA	<b>72%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>3%</b>
Seattle, WA	<b>71%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>8%</b>
Ann Arbor, MI	<b>79%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Overall Percent	<b>72%</b>	<b>80%</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>463 Participants</i>						
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	38%	46%	11%	5%	1%	<b>84%</b>
	Clear Content	57%	35%	6%			<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	45%	43%	10%	2%		<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	64%	29%	5%	2%		<b>93%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	42%	38%	14%	5%	1%	<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	48%	38%	11%	3%	1%	<b>86%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	66%	26%	6%	2%		<b>92%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	51%	37%	10%	2%	1%	<b>88%</b>
	Improve Understanding	43%	39%	9%	1%		<b>82%</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>33 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	27%	45%	18%	9%		<b>73%</b>
	Clear Content	42%	48%	9%			<b>91%</b>
	Challenging Content	42%	39%	9%	6%	3%	<b>82%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	55%	39%	3%	3%		<b>94%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	48%	30%	15%	3%	3%	<b>79%</b>
	Clear Content	36%	39%	15%	6%	3%	<b>76%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	45%	21%	24%	9%		<b>67%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	52%	27%	18%	3%		<b>79%</b>
	Improve Understanding						<b>0%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (1)</b>							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	35%	41%	16%	8%		<b>76%</b>
	Clear Content	62%	24%	11%	3%		<b>86%</b>
	Challenging Content	51%	35%	14%			<b>86%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	70%	24%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	35%	38%	14%	8%	5%	<b>73%</b>
	Clear Content	46%	32%	14%	3%	5%	<b>78%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	73%	14%	11%	3%		<b>86%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	38%	43%	14%	3%	3%	<b>81%</b>
	Improve Understanding	43%	49%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>							
<i>31 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	32%	48%	13%	6%		<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	29%	42%	13%	16%		<b>71%</b>
	Challenging Content	26%	39%	26%	10%		<b>65%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	32%	52%	6%	3%	6%	<b>84%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	23%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Clear Content	74%	19%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	55%	45%				<b>100%</b>
	Improve Understanding	35%	52%	13%			<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>Berkeley, CA (1)</b>							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	53%	39%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Clear Content	66%	34%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	55%	37%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	58%	24%	13%	5%		<b>82%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	50%	37%	5%	8%		<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	45%	42%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	71%	24%	3%	3%		<b>95%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	63%	29%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
	Improve Understanding	53%	42%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (2)</b>							
<i>35 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	29%	43%	11%	14%	3%	<b>71%</b>
	Clear Content	31%	51%	14%	3%		<b>83%</b>
	Challenging Content	31%	51%	17%			<b>83%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	66%	31%		3%		<b>97%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	40%	20%	3%		<b>77%</b>
	Clear Content	56%	35%	9%			<b>91%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	69%	23%	6%	3%		<b>91%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	37%	60%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Improve Understanding	31%	49%	20%			<b>80%</b>
<b>Berkeley, CA (2)</b>							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	50%	45%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Clear Content	74%	24%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	50%	45%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	76%	16%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	18%	34%	29%	18%		<b>53%</b>
	Clear Content	16%	45%	18%	21%		<b>61%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	37%	39%	13%	8%	3%	<b>76%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	39%	34%	24%	3%		<b>74%</b>
	Improve Understanding	45%	47%	8%			<b>92%</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>30 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	47%	37%	13%	3%		<b>83%</b>
	Clear Content	60%	37%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	53%	43%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	57%	23%	20%			<b>80%</b>
	Clear Content	60%	37%		3%		<b>97%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Improve Understanding	60%	37%	3%			<b>97%</b>
		<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>40 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	35%	45%	15%	5%		<b>80%</b>
	Clear Content	70%	25%	3%	3%		<b>95%</b>
	Challenging Content	50%	30%	20%			<b>80%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	88%	10%	3%			<b>98%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	40%	45%	13%	3%		<b>85%</b>
	Clear Content	53%	38%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	73%	25%	3%			<b>98%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	38%	45%	13%	5%		<b>83%</b>
	Improve Understanding	58%	28%	13%		3%	<b>85%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Ithaca, NY</b>							
<i>39 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	33%	54%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	69%	23%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	46%	51%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	74%	23%	3%			<b>97%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	36%	51%	5%	8%		<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	44%	41%	13%		3%	<b>85%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	56%	41%		3%		<b>97%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	51%	36%	10%	3%		<b>87%</b>
	Improve Understanding	46%	41%	10%	3%		<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>Providence, RI</b>							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	53%	8%	3%	3%	<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	61%	37%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	39%	50%	11%			<b>89%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	47%	47%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	37%	39%	21%	3%		<b>76%</b>
	Clear Content	47%	47%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	61%	29%	11%			<b>89%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	50%	39%	8%		3%	<b>89%</b>
	Improve Understanding	34%	50%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	45%	8%	13%		<b>79%</b>
	Clear Content	63%	26%	11%			<b>89%</b>
	Challenging Content	42%	42%	13%		3%	<b>84%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	63%	32%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	34%	47%	16%	3%		<b>82%</b>
	Clear Content	42%	34%	18%	5%		<b>76%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	66%	29%	5%			<b>95%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	39%	45%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
	Improve Understanding	42%	39%	18%			<b>82%</b>
<b>Seattle, WA</b>							
<i>31 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	29%	58%	10%		3%	<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	32%	68%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	39%	55%	3%	3%		<b>94%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	35%	48%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	45%	42%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	58%	29%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	84%	13%	3%			<b>97%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	61%	32%	3%		3%	<b>94%</b>
	Improve Understanding	45%	52%	3%			<b>97%</b>

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

Ann Arbor, MI		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	49%	51%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	65%	32%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Challenging Content	50%	44%	3%	3%		<b>94%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	76%	21%	3%			<b>97%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	53%	38%	9%			<b>91%</b>
	Clear Content	56%	44%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	65%	23%	11%			<b>88%</b>
	Improve Understanding	51%	40%	6%			<b>91%</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>463 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	55%	28%	13%	3%	3%	<b>83%</b>
Leadership Team	54%	26%	13%	5%	5%	<b>80%</b>
Program Coordinators	60%	25%	12%	2%	2%	<b>85%</b>
Residence Halls	19%	30%	34%	12%	3%	<b>49%</b>
Food	14%	22%	35%	20%	7%	<b>37%</b>
Recreational Activities	31%	31%	29%	6%	1%	<b>62%</b>



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

<b>Houston, TX</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>33 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	53%	23%	17%	5%	3%	<b>76%</b>
Leadership Team	67%	27%	2%			<b>94%</b>
Program Coordinators	46%	28%	19%	3%	3%	<b>75%</b>
Residence Halls	27%	52%	18%	3%		<b>79%</b>
Food	3%	6%	39%	30%	21%	<b>9%</b>
Recreational Activities	21%	33%	30%	9%		<b>55%</b>
<b>New Haven, CT (1)</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>37 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	22%	16%	3%		<b>81%</b>
Leadership Team	54%	30%	5%	5%	5%	<b>84%</b>
Program Coordinators	61%	24%	12%	2%		<b>86%</b>
Residence Halls		14%	38%	32%	14%	<b>14%</b>
Food	14%	41%	30%	14%	3%	<b>54%</b>
Recreational Activities	24%	27%	41%	8%		<b>51%</b>
<b>Los Angeles, CA</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	10%	32%	35%	23%		<b>42%</b>
Leadership Team	39%	32%	23%	6%		<b>71%</b>
Program Coordinators	73%	16%	10%	1%		<b>89%</b>
Residence Halls	16%	35%	45%	3%		<b>52%</b>
Food	29%	35%	26%	6%	3%	<b>65%</b>
Recreational Activities	35%	42%	16%	6%		<b>77%</b>
<b>Berkeley, CA (1)</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>38 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	66%	16%	16%		3%	<b>82%</b>
Leadership Team	63%	24%	13%			<b>87%</b>
Program Coordinators	52%	34%	12%	3%		<b>86%</b>
Residence Halls	5%	34%	39%	16%	5%	<b>39%</b>
Food	8%	13%	42%	24%	13%	<b>21%</b>
Recreational Activities	37%	32%	24%	3%	3%	<b>68%</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>New Haven, CT (2)</b> <i>35 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	34%	40%	17%	6%		<b>74%</b>
Leadership Team	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Program Coordinators	66%	21%	9%	2%	2%	<b>87%</b>
Residence Halls	3%	9%	29%	32%	3%	<b>12%</b>
Food	21%	29%	38%	12%		<b>50%</b>
Recreational Activities	32%	26%	35%	3%		<b>59%</b>
<b>Berkeley, CA (2)</b> <i>38 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	76%	16%	5%	3%		<b>92%</b>
Leadership Team	21%	16%	29%	21%	13%	<b>37%</b>
Program Coordinators	39%	20%	27%	9%	5%	<b>60%</b>
Residence Halls	3%	27%	57%	14%		<b>30%</b>
Food	3%	14%	46%	27%	11%	<b>16%</b>
Recreational Activities	22%	35%	35%	5%	3%	<b>57%</b>
<b>Oberlin, OH</b> <i>30 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	59%	28%	10%		3%	<b>86%</b>
Leadership Team	65%	28%	3%	2%	2%	<b>93%</b>
Program Coordinators	74%	18%	7%	1%		<b>92%</b>
Residence Halls	30%	43%	17%	7%	3%	<b>73%</b>
Food	10%	13%	47%	27%	3%	<b>23%</b>
Recreational Activities	43%	20%	23%	13%		<b>63%</b>
<b>Winston-Salem, NC</b> <i>40 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	60%	30%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Leadership Team	40%	38%	18%	5%		<b>78%</b>
Program Coordinators	56%	28%	14%	1%	1%	<b>84%</b>
Residence Halls	41%	21%	31%	8%		<b>62%</b>
Food	18%	18%	31%	28%	5%	<b>36%</b>
Recreational Activities	39%	39%	16%	3%		<b>79%</b>

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

<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>39 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	50%	39%	11%			<b>89%</b>
Leadership Team	39%	34%	26%			<b>74%</b>
Program Coordinators	50%	32%	11%	4%	3%	<b>81%</b>
Residence Halls	21%	53%	26%			<b>74%</b>
Food	16%	42%	16%	13%	3%	<b>58%</b>
Recreational Activities	21%	34%	26%	11%	3%	<b>55%</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>38 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	55%	34%	11%			<b>89%</b>
Leadership Team	45%	34%	16%	5%		<b>79%</b>
Program Coordinators	61%	24%	11%	3%	1%	<b>86%</b>
Residence Halls	6%	14%	44%	22%	14%	<b>19%</b>
Food	6%	14%	34%	29%	17%	<b>20%</b>
Recreational Activities	33%	28%	36%	3%		<b>61%</b>
<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>38 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	65%	22%	14%			<b>86%</b>
Leadership Team	54%	19%	19%	8%		<b>73%</b>
Program Coordinators	71%	22%	7%		1%	<b>93%</b>
Residence Halls	26%	29%	34%	8%	3%	<b>55%</b>
Food	34%	29%	32%	5%		<b>63%</b>
Recreational Activities	32%	32%	26%	11%		<b>63%</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>31 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	48%	45%	6%			<b>94%</b>
Leadership Team	61%	16%	10%	5%		<b>77%</b>
Program Coordinators	65%	31%	4%			<b>96%</b>
Residence Halls	48%	29%	19%	3%		<b>77%</b>
Food	19%	23%	42%	13%	3%	<b>42%</b>
Recreational Activities	45%	35%	13%	6%		<b>81%</b>

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

<b>Ann Arbor, MI</b>	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<i>35 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	74%	24%	3%			<b>97%</b>
Leadership Team	76%	24%				<b>100%</b>
Program Coordinators	69%	24%	7%			<b>93%</b>
Residence Halls	29%	29%	35%	6%		<b>59%</b>
Food	9%	12%	41%	29%	9%	<b>21%</b>
Recreational Activities	18%	24%	56%	3%		<b>41%</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>Overall</b>	<i>69 Participants</i>						
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	39%	51%	7%	1%	1%	<b>90%</b>
	Clear Content	51%	42%	4%	1%		<b>93%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	51%	43%	3%	3%		<b>94%</b>
	Clear Content	54%	39%	3%	1%	3%	<b>93%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	68%	28%	3%	1%		<b>96%</b>
	Challenging Content	43%	48%	7%		1%	<b>91%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	65%	26%	6%		3%	<b>91%</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>9 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	33%	67%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	44%	56%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	33%	67%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	44%	56%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	67%	22%	11%			<b>89%</b>
	Challenging Content	44%	44%	11%			<b>89%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	67%	33%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Los Angeles, CA</b>							
<i>18 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	61%	33%		6%		<b>94%</b>
	Clear Content	61%	39%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	61%	39%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	61%	39%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	50%	50%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Oberlin, OH</b>							
<i>17 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	47%	47%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Clear Content	71%	18%	6%			<b>88%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	76%	12%	6%		6%	<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	59%	35%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Challenging Content	59%	35%	6%			<b>94%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	71%	18%	6%		6%	<b>88%</b>
<b>Seattle, WA</b>							
<i>25 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	20%	60%	16%		4%	<b>80%</b>
	Clear Content	32%	56%	8%	4%		<b>88%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	36%	48%	8%	8%		<b>84%</b>
	Clear Content	36%	52%	4%	4%	4%	<b>88%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	60%	36%		4%		<b>96%</b>
	Challenging Content	28%	56%	12%		4%	<b>84%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	52%	32%	12%		4%	<b>84%</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>69 Participants</i>						
Professors	61%	27%	8%	3%	1%	<b>88%</b>
Mentor Teachers	65%	26%	7%	1%		<b>91%</b>
Program Components						
Lectures	41%	38%	19%	1%	1%	<b>78%</b>
Activities	57%	30%	13%			<b>87%</b>
Overall	48%	41%	9%	3%		<b>88%</b>
Residence Halls	16%	22%	39%	9%	4%	<b>38%</b>
Food	24%	22%	41%	13%		<b>46%</b>
Recreational Activities	17%	17%	29%	3%	1%	<b>34%</b>
			<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding		<b>Quite a Bit</b> 62%	33%			

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

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



Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, 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>17 Participants</i>						
Professors	65%	18%	12%	6%		<b>82%</b>
Mentor Teachers	71%	18%	12%			<b>88%</b>
Program Components						
Lectures	59%	12%	29%			<b>71%</b>
Activities	65%	29%	6%			<b>94%</b>
Overall	71%	18%	12%			<b>88%</b>
Residence Halls	12%	12%	47%	12%	6%	<b>24%</b>
Food	18%	35%	47%			<b>53%</b>
Recreational Activities	12%	24%	24%	6%		<b>35%</b>
			<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding		<b>Quite a Bit</b> 65%	35%			
<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>25 Participants</i>						
Professors	44%	40%	8%	4%	4%	<b>84%</b>
Mentor Teachers	44%	44%	8%	4%		<b>88%</b>
Program Components						
Lectures	28%	44%	20%	4%	4%	<b>72%</b>
Activities	52%	28%	20%			<b>80%</b>
Overall	28%	48%	16%	8%		<b>76%</b>
Residence Halls	20%	28%	36%	4%		<b>48%</b>
Food	20%	20%	36%	24%		<b>40%</b>
Recreational Activities	12%	12%	40%			<b>24%</b>
			<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding		<b>Quite a Bit</b> 52%	36%	12%		

Table 6. Economic History for Leaders

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

**Medford, MA**

		<b>Strongly</b>				<b>Strongly</b>	
<i>32 Participants</i>		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Morning	Stimulated Interest	19%	65%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
	Clear Content	32%	52%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
	Challenging Content	23%	45%	26%	6%		<b>68%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	45%	35%	13%	6%		<b>81%</b>
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	42%	35%	23%			<b>77%</b>
	Clear Content	48%	29%	13%	6%	3%	<b>77%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	45%	35%	10%	3%	6%	<b>81%</b>
Overall	Recommend Program	35%	55%	6%			<b>90%</b>
	Improve Understanding	42%	42%	16%			<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		52%	26%	16%	6%		<b>77%</b>
Leadership Program		44%	32%	19%	3%	2%	<b>76%</b>
Program Coordinators		48%	30%	18%	3%	1%	<b>78%</b>
Residence Halls		6%	16%	55%	23%		<b>23%</b>
Food		6%	42%	32%	13%	6%	<b>48%</b>
Recreational Activities		26%	35%	29%	10%		<b>61%</b>

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
49%	62%	13%

**St. Louis, MO**

		<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	26%	55%	13%	3%	3%	<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	55%	45%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	39%	42%	16%	3%		<b>81%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	61%	35%	3%			<b>97%</b>
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	26%	39%	19%	13%	3%	<b>65%</b>
	Clear Content	29%	55%	10%	6%		<b>84%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	45%	39%	13%		3%	<b>84%</b>
Overall	Recommend Program	29%	45%	19%	6%		<b>74%</b>
	Improve Understanding	55%	26%	19%			<b>81%</b>
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Economics Team		41%	38%	17%	3%		<b>79%</b>
Leadership Program		60%	35%	3%	2%		<b>95%</b>
Program Coordinators		44%	17%	24%	7%	6%	<b>61%</b>
Residence Halls		47%	40%	10%	3%		<b>87%</b>
Food		3%	23%	53%	17%	3%	<b>27%</b>
Recreational Activities		13%	47%	37%		3%	<b>60%</b>

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
50%	63%	13%

Table 7. Economic History for Leaders  
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	50%	46%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Clear Content	58%	42%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	58%	38%		4%		<b>96%</b>
	Clear Content	67%	29%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	88%	13%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	58%	38%	4%			<b>96%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	79%	21%				<b>100%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Professor	75%	17%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Mentor Teacher	63%	25%	13%			<b>88%</b>
	Program Components						<b>0%</b>
	Lectures	46%	38%	17%			<b>83%</b>
	Activities	46%	42%	13%			<b>88%</b>
	Overall	46%	38%	17%			<b>83%</b>
	Residence Halls	41%	18%	32%	9%		<b>59%</b>
	Food	46%	4%	38%	13%		<b>50%</b>
	Recreational Activities	15%	31%	46%	8%		<b>46%</b>
		<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some-what</b>	<b>No</b>			
	Changed Understanding	75%	25%				
<b>St. Louis, MO</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>15 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	53%	47%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	67%	33%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	60%	40%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	87%	13%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	67%	33%				<b>100%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	87%	13%				<b>100%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Professor	47%	40%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Mentor Teacher	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Program Components						<b>0%</b>
	Lectures	47%	40%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Activities	67%	33%				<b>100%</b>
	Overall	73%	27%				<b>100%</b>
	Residence Halls	7%	60%	33%			<b>67%</b>
	Food	40%	27%	27%	7%		<b>67%</b>
	Recreational Activities	17%	17%	50%	17%		<b>33%</b>
		<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some-what</b>	<b>No</b>			
	Changed Understanding	50%	50%				

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

**Atlanta, GA**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>32 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	69%	28%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Clear Content	69%	31%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	66%	34%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	66%	31%	3%			<b>97%</b>
Overall	Recommend Program	91%	9%				<b>100%</b>
	Improve Teaching	78%	22%				<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	50%	28%	22%			<b>78%</b>
	Issues of International Trade	59%	34%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor	59%	25%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
	Economics of Water Use and the Environment	53%	31%	13%	3%		<b>84%</b>
	Professor	69%	13%	19%			<b>81%</b>
	Mentor Teacher	84%	9%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Meeting Spaces	39%	35%	26%			<b>74%</b>
	Food	41%	38%	22%			<b>78%</b>

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

**Hollywood Beach, FL**

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

Table 10. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Overall**

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

Table 10. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Starkville, MS**

		<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>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	69%	23%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Clear Content	65%	27%	4%	4%		<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	69%	15%	15%			<b>85%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	77%	19%	4%			<b>96%</b>
	Recommend Program	65%	19%	12%			<b>85%</b>
	Improve Teaching	54%	27%	19%			<b>81%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	69%	12%	15%	4%		<b>81%</b>
	Program Site	23%	23%	50%	4%		<b>46%</b>
	Food	65%	8%	19%	4%		<b>73%</b>

**Jackson, MS**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>44 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	75%	23%		2%		<b>98%</b>
	Clear Content	82%	18%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	82%	14%	2%			<b>95%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	84%	14%	2%			<b>98%</b>
	Improve Teaching	64%	34%		2%		<b>98%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	73%	25%	2%			<b>98%</b>
	Program Site	39%	34%	27%			<b>73%</b>
	Food	48%	27%	23%	2%		<b>75%</b>

**Edmond, OK**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>20 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	75%	15%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	60%	40%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	80%	15%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Improve Teaching	55%	40%	5%			<b>95%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	75%	20%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Program Site	30%	45%	20%	5%		<b>75%</b>
	Food	30%	20%	35%	10%	5%	<b>50%</b>

Table 10. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Lincoln, NE**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	<i>11 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	73%	18%		9%		91%
	Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
	Recommend Program	91%	9%				100%
	Improve Teaching	91%	9%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	73%	27%				100%
	Program Site	64%	27%	9%			91%
	Food	45%	9%	36%			55%

**Little Rock, AR**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	<i>18 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	89%	11%				100%
	Challenging Content	94%	6%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	76%	24%				100%
	Program Site	56%	17%	28%			72%
	Food	56%	39%	6%			94%

**Birmingham, AL**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
Sessions	<i>17 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	65%	35%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	76%	24%				100%
	Improve Teaching	65%	35%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	59%	41%				100%
	Program Site	41%	29%	29%			71%
	Food	47%	18%	24%	6%	6%	65%



Table 10. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Murfreesboro, TN**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
	Clear Content	72%	28%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	72%	28%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
	Improve Teaching	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	78%	22%				<b>100%</b>
	Program Site	56%	33%	11%			<b>89%</b>
	Food	56%	33%	11%			<b>89%</b>

**Bentonville, AR**

		<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>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	67%	29%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Clear Content	86%	14%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	76%	24%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	67%	29%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Improve Teaching	67%	29%	5%			<b>95%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	71%	24%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Program Site	38%	29%	33%			<b>67%</b>
	Food	86%	10%	5%			<b>95%</b>

**Gulfport, MS**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>15 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	60%	27%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	13%	7%			<b>93%</b>
	Challenging Content	80%	13%	7%			<b>93%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	67%	27%	7%			<b>93%</b>
	Improve Teaching	67%	27%	7%			<b>93%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	73%	13%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Program Site	60%	27%	13%			<b>87%</b>
	Food	47%	33%	20%			<b>80%</b>

Table 10. Fundamentals of Environmental Economics  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

**Tulsa, OK**

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>20 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	65%	30%	5%			<b>95%</b>
	Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	Recommend Program	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Improve Teaching	65%	25%	10%			<b>90%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Overall	Instructor	65%	25%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Program Site	55%	25%	20%			<b>80%</b>
	Food	60%	30%	10%			<b>90%</b>

**Little Rock, AR**

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

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
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>120 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	58%	34%	7%	1%		<b>93%</b>
Clear Content	60%	37%	2%	2%		<b>97%</b>
Challenging Content	51%	41%	7%	1%		<b>92%</b>
Responsive Instructors	74%	23%	3%			<b>98%</b>
Recommend Course	63%	30%	6%	2%		<b>92%</b>
Improve Teaching	58%	35%	4%	1%		<b>93%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	55%	34%	8%	2%	2%	<b>89%</b>
Meeting Space	43%	40%	15%	2%		<b>83%</b>
Food	49%	31%	15%	3%	1%	<b>80%</b>

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
Teacher Evaluations

**Edmond, OK**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	60%	40%				<b>100%</b>
Clear Content	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	60%	40%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
Improve Teaching	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
Meeting Space	50%	40%		10%		<b>90%</b>
Food	30%	40%	10%	10%		<b>70%</b>

**Wilson, NC**

	<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>						
Stimulated Interest	67%	25%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Clear Content	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	71%	25%		4%		<b>96%</b>
Responsive Instructors	96%	4%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	67%	25%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Improve Teaching	63%	21%	8%			<b>83%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	67%	29%	4%			<b>96%</b>
Meeting Space	29%	46%	21%	4%		<b>75%</b>
Food	46%	29%	17%	8%		<b>75%</b>

**Boise, ID**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Clear Content	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Responsive Instructors	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	80%	10%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Improve Teaching	70%	20%	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	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Meeting Space	60%	30%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Food	50%	20%	30%			<b>70%</b>

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
Teacher Evaluations

**Wichita, KS**

	<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	48%	33%	14%	5%		<b>81%</b>
Clear Content	57%	38%		5%		<b>95%</b>
Challenging Content	55%	35%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Responsive Instructors	67%	24%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Recommend Course	45%	45%	5%	5%		<b>90%</b>
Improve Teaching	52%	38%	5%	5%		<b>90%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	52%	33%	10%		5%	<b>86%</b>
Meeting Space	48%	29%	20%			<b>76%</b>
Food	57%	29%	14%			<b>86%</b>

**Topeka, KS**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>20 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Clear Content	95%	5%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	75%	25%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	95%	5%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	95%	5%				<b>100%</b>
Improve Teaching	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	80%	15%	5%			<b>95%</b>
Meeting Space	55%	40%	5%			<b>95%</b>
Food	75%	25%				<b>100%</b>

**Orange City, IA**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>15 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	20%	73%	7%			<b>93%</b>
Clear Content	20%	73%	7%			<b>93%</b>
Challenging Content		87%	13%			<b>87%</b>
Responsive Instructors	47%	53%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	33%	53%	13%			<b>87%</b>
Improve Teaching	20%	80%				<b>100%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	20%	67%	13%			<b>87%</b>
Meeting Space	47%	47%	7%			<b>93%</b>
Food	33%	33%	27%			<b>67%</b>

Table 11. Rejuvenating the Economics Classroom  
Teacher Evaluations

**Denver, CO**

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

Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues  
Teacher Evaluations

**Overall**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	
<i>70 Participants</i>						<b>SA+A</b>
Stimulated Interest	59%	40%	1%			<b>99%</b>
Clear Content	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	71%	27%	1%			<b>99%</b>
Responsive Instructors	86%	13%	1%			<b>99%</b>
Recommend Course	76%	24%				<b>100%</b>
Improve Teaching	66%	33%	1%			<b>99%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	71%	29%				<b>100%</b>
Meeting Space	39%	43%	19%			<b>81%</b>
Food	20%	50%	23%	4%		<b>70%</b>

Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues  
Teacher Evaluations

**Roanoke, VA**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>18 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				100%
Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
Challenging Content	78%	17%	6%			94%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	94%	6%				100%
Improve Teaching	89%	11%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	89%	11%				100%
Meeting Space	50%	33%	17%			83%
Food	50%	33%	17%			83%

**St. Cloud, MN**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>16 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	63%	38%				100%
Clear Content	88%	13%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	69%	31%				100%
Improve Teaching	63%	38%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	63%	38%				100%
Meeting Space	6%	63%	31%			69%
Food	13%	31%	38%	19%		44%

**Honolulu, HI**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>4 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	75%	25%				100%
Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	75%	25%				100%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	75%	25%				100%
Meeting Space	75%	25%				100%
Food	25%	25%	50%			50%



Table 12. Understanding Global Economic Issues  
Teacher Evaluations

**St. Charles, MO**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>12 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	25%	75%				<b>100%</b>
Clear Content	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	75%	25%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	50%	50%				<b>100%</b>
Improve Teaching	50%	42%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	58%	42%				<b>100%</b>
Meeting Space	33%	42%	25%			<b>75%</b>
Food	17%	25%	42%			<b>42%</b>

**Newark, DE**

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

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

**EODO Spring 2018**

	<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	82%	18%				<b>100%</b>
Clear Content	45%	45%		9%		<b>91%</b>
Challenging Content	82%	18%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	73%	18%	9%			<b>91%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	82%	18%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	70%	20%		10%		<b>90%</b>
Improve Teaching		90%		10%		<b>90%</b>
	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	36%	64%				<b>100%</b>
Lectures	18%	64%	9%	9%		<b>82%</b>
Activities	27%	45%	27%			<b>73%</b>
Assignments	27%	45%	27%			<b>73%</b>
Materials	27%	55%	18%			<b>82%</b>
Discussion Boards	27%	36%	36%			<b>64%</b>

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

**TE - FR Winter 2018**

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

Table 15. Teacher Economics - World Development  
Teacher Evaluations

<b>TE-WD</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				<b>100%</b>
Clear Content	70%	30%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	50%	40%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Responsive Instructors	70%	20%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	60%	10%	20%	10%		<b>70%</b>
	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	60%	30%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Lectures	10%	40%	50%			<b>50%</b>
Activities	10%	50%	20%	10%		<b>60%</b>
Assignments	20%	60%	10%	10%		<b>80%</b>
Materials	20%	50%	30%			<b>70%</b>
Discussion Boards	20%	50%	10%			<b>70%</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>32 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	59%	31%	7%			<b>90%</b>
Clear Content	49%	44%	4%			<b>93%</b>
Challenging Content	59%	41%	41%			<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	80%	13%	13%			<b>93%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	86%	14%	14%			<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	56%	24%	24%	4%	3%	<b>79%</b>
	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	40%	33%	17%	8%		<b>73%</b>
Lectures	16%	33%	48%	0%		<b>49%</b>
Activities	31%	52%	14%	4%		<b>83%</b>
Assignments	23%	27%	36%	11%		<b>50%</b>
Materials	23%	43%	20%	15%	0%	<b>65%</b>
Discussion Boards	20%	43%	27%	8%	3%	<b>63%</b>

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

**EOFT-2 Fall 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>8 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	63%	25%	13%			<b>88%</b>
Clear Content	38%	50%		13%		<b>88%</b>
Challenging Content	50%	50%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	75%	13%	13%			<b>88%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	88%	13%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	50%	25%	13%		13%	<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	38%	25%	25%			<b>63%</b>
Lectures	13%	38%	38%		13%	<b>50%</b>
Activities	13%	75%	13%			<b>88%</b>
Assignments	25%	25%	38%		13%	<b>50%</b>
Materials	25%	63%	13%			<b>88%</b>
Discussion Boards	13%	50%	25%		13%	<b>63%</b>

**EOFT-1 Winter 2018**

	<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>12 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	75%	17%				<b>92%</b>
Clear Content	67%	33%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	75%	25%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				<b>100%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	92%	8%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	75%	17%	8%			<b>92%</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%	42%	33%			<b>67%</b>
Activities	33%	58%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Assignments	25%	25%	50%			<b>50%</b>
Materials	33%	42%	25%			<b>75%</b>
Discussion Boards	25%	50%	25%			<b>75%</b>

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

**EOFT - 2 Summer 2018**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>12 Participants</i>						
Stimulated Interest	40%	50%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Clear Content	40%	50%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Challenging Content	50%	50%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	80%	10%	10%			<b>90%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	80%	20%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	40%	30%	20%	10%		<b>70%</b>
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	40%	20%	20%	20%		<b>60%</b>
Lectures	10%	20%	70%			<b>30%</b>
Activities	40%	30%	20%	10%		<b>70%</b>
Assignments	20%	30%	20%	30%		<b>50%</b>
Materials	10%	30%	20%	40%		<b>40%</b>
Discussion Boards	20%	30%	30%	20%		<b>50%</b>

Table 17. Economics History Online for Teachers  
Teacher Evaluations

**EHOFT Part 1 Summer 2018**

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



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

**EDSUO**

<i>13 Participants</i>	<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>
Stimulated Interest	85%	8%			8%	<b>92%</b>
Clear Content	92%	8%				<b>100%</b>
Challenging Content	92%	8%				<b>100%</b>
Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				<b>100%</b>
Timely Return of Assignments	92%	8%				<b>100%</b>
Recommend Course	77%	23%				<b>100%</b>
Improve Teaching	40%	50%		10%		<b>90%</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	85%	15%				<b>100%</b>
Lectures	62%	15%	15%	8%		<b>77%</b>
Activities	54%	38%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Assignments	46%	31%	23%			<b>77%</b>
Materials	62%	31%	8%			<b>92%</b>
Discussion Boards	46%	38%	15%			<b>85%</b>

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

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

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

<b>Alexandria, VA</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>75 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	39%	51%	9%	1%		<b>89%</b>
	Clear Content	51%	44%	4%		1%	<b>95%</b>
	Challenging Content	35%	52%	13%		1%	<b>87%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	45%	39%	13%		1%	<b>84%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	28%	44%	24%	3%	1%	<b>72%</b>
	Improve Understanding	35%	47%	16%	1%	1%	<b>81%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	41%	36%	20%	2%	1%	<b>77%</b>
	Meeting Space						<b>0%</b>
	Food						<b>0%</b>
<b>Grand Junction, CO</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>31 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	39%	42%	16%	3%		<b>81%</b>
	Clear Content	65%	35%				<b>100%</b>
	Challenging Content	61%	39%				<b>100%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	58%	32%	10%			<b>90%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	68%	29%	3%			<b>97%</b>
	Improve Understanding						<b>0%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	65%	27%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Meeting Space	55%	39%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Food	52%	32%	10%	6%		<b>84%</b>
<b>Omaha, NE</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>83 Participants</i>							
	Stimulated Interest	14%	64%	20%	1%		<b>78%</b>
	Clear Content	51%	43%	6%			<b>94%</b>
	Challenging Content	36%	49%	11%	4%		<b>86%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	43%	48%	8%			<b>92%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	43%	41%	12%	4%		<b>84%</b>
	Improve Understanding	29%	58%	12%	1%		<b>87%</b>
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	46%	32%	19%	1%	1%	<b>78%</b>
	Meeting Space						<b>0%</b>
	Food						<b>0%</b>

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

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

Table 20. Innovation and Entrepreneurship  
 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>Tampa, FL</b>							
	<i>24 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	21%	42%	29%	4%	4%	<b>63%</b>
	Clear Content	46%	42%	8%		4%	<b>88%</b>
	Challenging Content	33%	42%	13%	8%	4%	<b>75%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	54%	25%	17%		4%	<b>79%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	33%	25%	38%		4%	<b>58%</b>
	Improve Understanding	38%	42%	13%	4%	4%	<b>79%</b>
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	46%	33%	13%	4%		<b>79%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>St. Charles, MO</b>							
	<i>49 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	20%	43%	31%	6%		<b>63%</b>
	Clear Content	63%	29%	8%			<b>92%</b>
	Challenging Content	51%	39%	6%	2%	2%	<b>90%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	51%	45%	4%			<b>96%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	27%	41%	27%	6%		<b>67%</b>
	Improve Understanding	41%	47%	10%		2%	<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	47%	35%	6%	1%	1%	<b>82%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Farmington Hills, MI</b>							
	<i>40 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	10%	60%	30%			<b>70%</b>
	Clear Content	33%	58%	10%			<b>90%</b>
	Challenging Content	25%	53%	18%	5%		<b>78%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	30%	55%	15%			<b>85%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	15%	45%	25%	15%		<b>60%</b>
	Improve Understanding	8%	70%	13%	10%		<b>78%</b>
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	26%	34%	25%	14%	1%	<b>60%</b>
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Madison, MS</b>							
	<i>46 Participants</i>						
	Stimulated Interest	13%	28%	22%	15%	22%	<b>41%</b>
	Clear Content	24%	37%	22%	11%	7%	<b>61%</b>
	Challenging Content	20%	26%	28%	17%	9%	<b>46%</b>
	Responsive Instructors	33%	30%	28%	4%	4%	<b>63%</b>
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	20%	17%	37%	11%	15%	<b>37%</b>
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Instructor Overall	27%	22%	35%	9%	4%	<b>49%</b>

Table 21. FTE 2017 Program  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire

**Overall**

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