

Table 1. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Performance on Achievement Test

	<b>Percent Correct</b>
Austin, TX	80
Santa Barbara, CA	82
Boulder, CO	83
Seattle, WA	76
Hillsdale, MI	80
Boston, MA	83
Chicago, IL	81
Williamsburg (students only)	86
Wooster, OH (students only)	78
Los Angeles (students only)	79
Nashville, TN (students only)	84
Ithaca, NY (students only)	87
Berkeley, CA (students only)	84
Overall*	82
National Average (2006) NAEP Items Used in FTE Test	53

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 2. Economics for Leaders  
Percent Correct on Pre-Test

	<b>Percent Correct</b>
Austin, TX	64
Santa Barbara, CA	70
Boulder, CO	71
Seattle, WA	67
Hillsdale, MI	77
Boston, MA	73
Chicago, IL	77
Williamsburg (students only)	70
Wooster, OH (students only)	72
Los Angeles (students only)	68
Nashville, TN (students only)	73
Ithaca, NY (students only)	76
Berkeley, CA (students only)	76
Overall Percent*	72

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 3.  
Economics for Leaders  
Percent Correct on Items, by Site and Overall

<i>Item #</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Austin, TX	84	97	100	91	66	78	78	44	81	75	91	94	97	78	75	66
Santa Barbara, CA	82	97	100	85	68	91	74	50	62	91	94	100	100	82	76	79
Boulder, CO	88	94	97	94	66	88	81	78	94	91	94	97	94	84	78	72
Seattle, WA	78	94	100	81	36	92	81	31	69	75	92	97	97	72	86	53
Hillsdale, MI	97	94	100	81	61	81	81	23	87	94	90	90	100	81	74	68
Boston, MA	88	100	100	91	61	97	94	70	97	85	94	91	100	79	91	61
Chicago, IL	66	94	100	94	59	91	94	34	78	72	91	94	88	91	94	56
Williamsburg (students only)	94	92	92	88	85	83	90	58	92	88	85	100	94	77	85	73
Wooster, OH (students only)	86	97	97	83	57	74	77	46	74	89	83	97	100	74	86	74
Los Angeles (students only)	98	98	94	86	84	80	92	55	75	45	86	94	96	82	92	75
Nashville, TN (students only)	82	98	100	86	65	90	88	84	69	80	94	100	98	84	82	67
Ithaca, NY (students only)	90	98	98	100	86	84	86	60	96	88	82	98	100	76	88	70
Berkeley, CA (students only)	92	96	90	82	78	92	68	52	82	78	88	98	96	86	84	68
Overall	87	96	97	88	69	86	84	54	81	80	89	96	97	80	84	68
<i>National Average (2006)</i> <i>NAEP Items Used in FTE Test</i>	40	56	83	65	35	63	53	32	40	39	64	83	59	61	71	45

Table 3.  
Economics for Leaders  
Percent Correct on Items, by Site and Overall

<i>Item #</i>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>AVG</b>
Austin, TX	91	81	84	81	78	69	100	88	91	78	81	66	75	56	<b>80</b>
Santa Barbara, CA	76	82	88	97	68	47	100	91	97	76	82	68	85	71	<b>82</b>
Boulder, CO	94	66	88	94	69	72	94	88	94	78	75	59	78	56	<b>83</b>
Seattle, WA	72	64	97	81	72	42	86	83	94	72	89	53	86	44	<b>76</b>
Hillsdale, MI	81	68	100	90	74	68	87	77	84	71	74	74	87	74	<b>80</b>
Boston, MA	82	85	100	85	64	61	91	73	91	70	91	58	85	58	<b>83</b>
Chicago, IL	88	78	94	94	75	69	97	84	94	78	75	56	97	56	<b>81</b>
Williamsburg (students only)	88	85	96	85	77	92	98	83	98	81	83	71	92	75	<b>86</b>
Wooster, OH (students only)	77	74	94	77	46	83	80	74	86	69	63	71	83	63	<b>78</b>
Los Angeles (students only)	73	73	88	82	61	59	82	82	82	73	80	55	86	57	<b>79</b>
Nashville, TN (students only)	94	82	98	92	78	73	94	76	96	82	82	71	82	63	<b>84</b>
Ithaca, NY (students only)	90	88	96	92	86	76	100	82	90	84	84	80	94	74	<b>87</b>
Berkeley, CA (students only)	82	84	88	90	84	88	90	82	96	72	90	68	96	74	<b>84</b>
Overall	84	78	93	88	72	70	92	82	92	76	81	66	87	64	82
<i>National Average (2006) NAEP Items Used in FTE Test</i>	53	54	79	67	36	21	52	45	52	51	51	49	49	40	53

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

<b>Overall*</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
<i>513 Participants</i>							
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	36%	51%	10%	2%	0%	87%
	Clear Content	63%	32%	4%	1%		95%
	Challenging Content	21%	35%	30%	12%	3%	55%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	21%	6%	1%	0%	93%
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	69%	22%	9%	1%		91%
	Clear Content	68%	25%	7%	1%	0%	93%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	16%	4%	1%	0%	95%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	77%	17%	5%	1%	0%	94%
	Improve Understanding	48%	40%	10%	1%	2%	88%
	Improve Leadership	68%	24%	7%	0%	0%	92%

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 4. 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>Austin, TX</b>							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	30%	45%	19%	6%		75%
	Clear Content	39%	52%	6%	3%		91%
	Challenging Content	16%	32%	39%	10%	3%	48%
	Responsive Instructors	33%	35%	23%	6%	3%	68%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	16%	13%			87%
	Clear Content	78%	19%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	68%	19%	10%		3%	87%
	Improve Understanding	39%	42%	13%		6%	81%
	Improve Leadership	74%	23%	3%			97%
<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>							
<i>34 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	47%	44%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	53%	44%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	12%	35%	38%	15%		47%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	79%	9%	12%			88%
	Clear Content	79%	18%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	9%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	91%	6%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	44%	53%	3%			97%
	Improve Leadership	71%	24%	5%			95%
<b>Boulder, CO</b>							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	35%	59%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	63%	37%				100%
	Challenging Content	41%	28%	19%	9%	3%	69%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	44%	41%	15%			85%
	Clear Content	44%	47%	6%	3%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	16%	3%	3%		94%
Overall	Recommend Program	75%	22%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	63%	28%	3%	6%		91%
	Improve Leadership	66%	25%	9%			91%

Table 4. 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>Seattle, WA</b>							
36 <i>Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	42%	50%	6%	2%		92%
	Clear Content	72%	22%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	25%	39%	31%	5%		64%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	28%	11%	3%		86%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	89%	11%				100%
	Clear Content	83%	14%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	94%	3%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	89%	8%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	58%	31%	8%	3%		89%
	Improve Leadership	89%	11%				100%
<b>Hillsdale, MI</b>							
31 <i>Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	52%	42%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	58%	39%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	32%	39%	13%	16%		71%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	19%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	87%	10%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	91%	6%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	13%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	84%	13%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	58%	26%	16%			84%
	Improve Leadership	80%	10%	10%			90%
<b>Boston, MA</b>							
33 <i>Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	24%	67%	6%	3%		91%
	Clear Content	67%	30%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	16%	42%	33%	6%	3%	58%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	27%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	61%	33%	3%	3%		94%
	Clear Content	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	82%	18%				100%
	Improve Understanding	55%	39%	6%			94%
	Improve Leadership	58%	33%	9%			91%

Table 4. 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>Chicago, IL</b>							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	19%	58%	13%	10%		77%
	Clear Content	42%	52%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	17%	16%	48%	16%	3%	33%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	23%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	43%	35%	19%	3%		78%
	Clear Content	45%	39%	10%	3%	3%	84%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	32%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	52%	26%	13%	9%		78%
	Improve Understanding	23%	52%	19%	3%	3%	75%
	Improve Leadership	33%	32%	29%	3%	3%	65%
<b>Williamsburg (students only)</b>							
<i>48 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	44%	48%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	75%	19%	4%	2%		94%
	Challenging Content	36%	33%	23%	6%	2%	69%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	19%	13%	3%		84%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	63%	23%	14%			86%
	Clear Content	54%	25%	19%	2%		79%
	Responsive Instructors	46%	25%	21%	8%		71%
Overall	Recommend Program	73%	21%	6%			94%
	Improve Understanding	57%	31%	10%		2%	88%
	Improve Leadership	63%	27%	8%		2%	90%
<b>Wooster, OH (students only)</b>							
<i>35 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	36%	52%	12%			88%
	Clear Content	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	16%	42%	24%	15%	3%	58%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	15%	9%			91%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	82%	12%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	18%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	70%	18%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding	33%	58%	9%			91%
	Improve Leadership	58%	30%	9%	3%		88%

Table 4. 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>Los Angeles (students only)</b>							
<i>51 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	28%	48%	22%	2%		76%
	Clear Content	60%	30%	8%	2%		90%
	Challenging Content	10%	36%	36%	12%	6%	46%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	22%	2%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	66%	24%	8%	2%		90%
	Clear Content	60%	30%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	12%	6%			94%
Overall	Recommend Program	84%	14%	2%			98%
	Improve Understanding	48%	34%	12%	2%	4%	82%
	Improve Leadership	68%	26%	6%			94%
<b>Nashville, TN (students only)</b>							
<i>49 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	49%	41%	8%	2%		90%
	Clear Content	84%	16%				100%
	Challenging Content	24%	41%	27%	6%	2%	65%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	6%	4%			96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	22%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	67%	29%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	14%	4%	2%		94%
	Improve Understanding	61%	31%	8%			92%
	Improve Leadership	74%	20%	6%			94%
<b>Ithaca, NY (students only)</b>							
<i>50 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	33%	53%	12%	2%		86%
	Clear Content	65%	29%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	12%	35%	31%	18%	4%	47%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	16%	2%			98%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	86%	8%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	86%	14%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	76%	16%	4%	2%	2%	92%
	Improve Understanding	39%	49%	8%		4%	88%
	Improve Leadership	82%	14%	4%			96%

Table 4. 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 (students only)</b>							
<i>50 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	30%	62%	4%	2%	2%	92%
	Clear Content	68%	30%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	18%	30%	32%	16%	4%	48%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	28%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	22%	8%			92%
	Clear Content	54%	36%	8%	2%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	22%			4%	96%
Overall	Recommend Program	72%	24%	4%			96%
	Improve Understanding	42%	46%	10%		2%	88%
	Improve Leadership	60%	36%	4%			96%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Overall*</b>	<i>513 Participants</i>						
Professors		56%	28%	14%	2%	0%	84%
Mentor Teachers		53%	35%	11%	1%		88%
Student Administrators		79%	18%	3%	1%		97%
Leadership Coordinators		75%	20%	4%	1%	0%	95%
Program Coordinators		76%	20%	4%	1%		95%
Residence Halls		22%	30%	34%	11%	2%	53%
Food		20%	29%	28%	16%	7%	50%
Recreational Activities		42%	36%	18%	3%	1%	78%

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

<b>Austin, TX</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>32 Participants</i>						
Professors	Ken Leonard	13%	32%	42%	10%	3%	45%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	Malhaz Jiblazde	46%	35%	16%	3%		81%
Student Administrator	Jeff McMartin	90%	6%	3%			96%
Leadership Coordinator	Matt Holley	94%	6%				100%
Program Coordinators	as a group	84%	10%		6%		94%
Residence Halls		3%	3%	55%	29%	10%	6%
Food		3%	6%	18%	33%	39%	9%
Recreational Activities		45%	27%	15%		6%	73%
<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>34 Participants</i>						
Professors	Scott Baier	53%	41%	6%			94%
	Ken Leonard	39%	32%	26%	3%		71%
Mentor Teacher	Debbie Henney	36%	38%	26%			74%
Student Administrator	Philip Folsom	74%	26%				100%
Leadership Coordinator	Leo Van Warmerdam	88%	12%				100%
Program Coordinators	as a group	59%	29%	12%			88%
Residence Halls		50%	32%	15%	3%		82%
Food		59%	32%	9%			91%
Recreational Activities		56%	26%	12%	6%		82%
<b>Boulder, CO</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>32 Participants</i>						
Professors	Carlos Asarta	97%	3%				100%
	John Brock	19%	72%	9%			91%
Mentor Teachers	Tom Lampe	53%	38%	9%			91%
Student Administrator	Linwood Paul	84%	16%				100%
Leadership Coordinator	Jennifer Lueck	44%	34%	19%	3%		78%
Program Coordinators	as a group	78%	19%	3%			97%
Residence Halls		15%	33%	33%	18%		48%
Food		24%	30%	30%	15%		55%
Recreational Activities		58%	27%	15%			85%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

<b>Seattle, WA</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>36 Participants</i>						
Professors	Ken Leonard	56%	36%	8%			92%
	Dan Benjamin	42%	36%	22%			78%
Mentor Teacher	Alice Temnick	72%	22%	6%			94%
Student Administrator	Linwood Paul	86%	8%	6%			94%
Leadership Coordinators	Tony Poehling	94%	6%				100%
Program Coordinators	as a group	86%	14%				100%
Residence Halls		17%	36%	36%	11%		53%
Food		6%	44%	31%	17%	3%	50%
Recreational Activities		53%	33%	11%	3%		86%
<b>Hillsdale, MI</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>						
Professors	Roger Butters	90%	10%				100%
	Gary Wolfram	23%	42%	29%	6%		65%
Mentor Teacher	John Kessler	52%	48%				100%
Student Administrator	John Buck	94%	6%				100%
Leadership Coordinator	Rachel Moorhead	55%	45%				100%
Program Coordinators	as a group	100%					100%
Residence Halls		13%	28%	53%	6%		41%
Food		26%	61%	13%			87%
Recreational Activities		47%	44%	9%			91%
<b>Boston, MA</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>						
Professors	John Brock	61%	30%	9%			91%
	Ken Leonard	43%	39%	18%			82%
Mentor Teacher	Malhaz Jiblazde	76%	21%	3%			97%
Student Administrator	Bill Gregg	82%	18%				100%
Leadership Coordinator	Sophia Rodriguez	82%	18%				100%
Program Coordinators	as a group	79%	21%				100%
Residence Halls		23%	34%	40%	3%		57%
Food		17%	29%	34%	14%	6%	46%
Recreational Activities		40%	40%	20%			80%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

<b>Chicago, IL</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>32 Participants</i>						
Professors	Tomas Cvrcek	74%	16%	10%			90%
	Pat Fishe	26%	32%	32%	10%		58%
Mentor Teacher	John Kessler	42%	35%	16%	6%		77%
Student Administrator	David Soleil	58%	39%	3%			97%
Leadership Coordinator	Allison Heard	55%	26%	16%		3%	81%
Program Coordinators	as a group	70%	27%	3%			97%
Residence Halls		3%	10%	48%	23%	16%	13%
Food			16%	45%	35%	3%	16%
Recreational Activities		19%	39%	35%	3%	3%	58%
<b>Williamsburg (students only)</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>48 Participants</i>						
Professors	~						
	~						
Mentor Teacher	Debbie Henney	53%	33%	10%			86%
Student Administrator	Rich Dunsworth	59%	27%	6%	4%		86%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	79%	17%				96%
Residence Halls		3%	8%	52%	27%	6%	11%
Food		10%	31%	38%	15%	2%	41%
Recreational Activities		22%	33%	35%	4%		55%
<b>Wooster, OH (students only)</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>						
Professors	Eric Jamelske	67%	21%	6%			88%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	~						
Student Administrator	Phillip Folsom	88%	6%				94%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	49%	36%	9%			85%
Residence Halls		13%	48%	27%	6%		61%
Food		4%	15%	45%	27%	3%	19%
Recreational Activities		34%	36%	15%	6%	3%	70%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

<b>Los Angeles (students only)</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>51 Participants</i>						
Professors	Jim Charkins	52%	34%	10%	4%		86%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	~						
Student Administrator	Leslie Bourne	76%	22%	2%			98%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	82%	12%	6%			94%
Residence Halls		32%	30%	34%	4%		62%
Food		40%	34%	24%	2%		74%
Recreational Activities		46%	42%	8%	4%		88%
<b>Nashville, TN (students only)</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>49 Participants</i>						
Professors	Carlos Asarta	90%	6%	4%			96%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	~						
Student Administrator	Leslie Bourne	59%	29%	12%			88%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	80%	18%		2%		98%
Residence Halls		37%	43%	16%	4%		80%
Food		24%	35%	27%	10%	4%	59%
Recreational Activities		57%	29%	12%	2%		86%
<b>Ithaca, NY (students only)</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>50 Participants</i>						
Professors	~						
	~						
Mentor Teacher	Debbie Henney	45%	41%	14%			86%
Student Administrator	Philip Folson	90%	8%		2%		98%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	72%	24%	4%			96%
Residence Halls		45%	43%	10%	2%		88%
Food		35%	43%	20%	2%		78%
Recreational Activities		27%	39%	29%	4%	2%	66%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders  
 Student Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Organization, and Accommodations

<b>Berkeley, CA (students only)</b>		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	<i>50 Participants</i>						
Professors	Eric Jamelske	52%	42%	6%			94%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	~						
Student Administrator	Leslie Bourne	88%	12%				100%
Leadership Coordinator	~						
Program Coordinators	as a group	60%	26%	14%			86%
Residence Halls		18%	34%	38%	10%		52%
Food		8%	8%	22%	34%	26%	16%
Recreational Activities		38%	44%	12%	6%		82%

Table 6. 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>177 Participants</i>						
<b>Morning</b>	Stimulated Interest	70%	27%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	72%	24%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	49%	32%	16%	2%	1%	82%
	Helpful Materials	63%	28%	8%	1%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	17%	4%	1%		96%
<b>Afternoon</b>	Stimulated Interest	64%	31%	5%	1%		94%
	Clear Content	67%	28%	4%	1%		94%
	Challenging Content	54%	37%	6%	2%	0%	91%
	Helpful Materials	68%	26%	4%	2%	1%	94%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	14%	3%	1%		96%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	87%	10%	3%	0%		97%
	Improve Teaching	82%	15%	3%			97%

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 6. 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>Austin, TX</b>							
25							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	68%	32%				100%
	Clear Content	88%	12%				100%
	Challenging Content	52%	32%	8%	8%		84%
	Helpful Materials	72%	28%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	16%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	64%	32%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	72%	28%				100%
	Challenging Content	56%	36%		8%		92%
	Helpful Materials	80%	20%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	92%	4%	4%			96%
	Improve Teaching	84%	12%	4%			96%
<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>							
26 Participants							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	73%	23%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	69%	23%	8%			92%
	Challenging Content	50%	31%	15%		4%	81%
	Helpful Materials	62%	31%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	23%	8%	4%		88%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	62%	31%	4%	3%		93%
	Clear Content	69%	19%	12%			88%
	Challenging Content	54%	35%	8%		3%	89%
	Helpful Materials	65%	31%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	69%	15%	8%	8%		84%
Overall	Recommend Program	85%	15%				100%
	Improve Teaching	88%	8%	4%			96%
<b>Boulder, CO</b>							
29 Participants							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	59%	34%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	62%	24%	14%			86%
	Challenging Content	39%	28%	34%			67%
	Helpful Materials	49%	34%	17%			83%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	17%	10%			90%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	52%	34%	14%			86%
	Clear Content	59%	34%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	49%	34%	14%	3%		83%
	Helpful Materials	49%	34%	14%	3%		83%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	17%	7%			93%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	7%	10%	3%		87%
	Improve Teaching	73%	24%	3%			97%

Table 6. 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>Seattle, WA</b>							
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	79%	17%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	79%	17%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	67%	25%	4%	4%		92%
	Helpful Materials	83%	13%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	13%	4%			96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
	Clear Content	75%	25%				100%
	Challenging Content	79%	21%				100%
	Helpful Materials	88%	12%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Teaching	83%	17%				100%
<b>Hillsdale, MI</b>							
<i>28 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	86%	14%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	64%	29%	7%			93%
	Helpful Materials	68%	25%	4%	3%		93%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
	Clear Content	68%	29%		3%		97%
	Challenging Content	68%	32%				100%
	Helpful Materials	68%	21%	4%	7%		89%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	89%	11%				100%
	Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%
<b>Boston, MA</b>							
<i>19 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	74%	26%				100%
	Clear Content	79%	21%				100%
	Challenging Content	42%	32%	26%			74%
	Helpful Materials	63%	26%	8%			89%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	5%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	58%	42%				100%
	Clear Content	63%	32%		5%		95%
	Challenging Content	42%	47%	11%			89%
	Helpful Materials	74%	21%			5%	95%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	95%	5%				100%
	Improve Teaching	84%	16%				100%

Table 6. 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>Chicago, IL</b>							
<i>26 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	54%	42%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	58%	42%				100%
	Challenging Content	31%	50%	15%	4%		81%
	Helpful Materials	46%	38%	12%	4%		84%
Afternoon	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
	Stimulated Interest	62%	27%	8%	3%		89%
	Clear Content	62%	27%	8%	3%		89%
	Challenging Content	31%	54%	12%	3%		85%
Overall	Helpful Materials	58%	42%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	12%	3%			97%
	Recommend Program	81%	15%	4%			96%
	Improve Teaching	77%	15%	8%			92%

Table 7. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Overall*</b>						
<i>177 Participants</i>						
Professors	68%	23%	8%	1%		91%
Mentor Teachers	69%	24%	7%	0%		92%
Economics Curriculum						
Lectures	51%	35%	12%	2%		86%
Simulations	58%	30%	11%	1%		89%
Program Organization	57%	31%	11%	1%		89%
Residence Halls	26%	17%	27%	23%	5%	43%
Food	34%	34%	29%	10%	1%	68%
		<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding of Government's Role		34%	44%	19%		

\*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 7. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Austin, TX</b>							
	<i>25 Participants</i>						
Professors	Ken Leonard	76%	12%	12%			88%
	~						
Mentor Teacher	Malhaz Jiblazde	44%	36%	20%			80%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	52%	44%	4%			96%
	Simulations	56%	24%	20%			80%
Program Organization		60%	24%	12%			84%
Residence Halls		36%	28%	16%			64%
Food		8%	28%	28%	20%	12%	36%
			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			28%	36%	32%		
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>							
	<i>26 Participants</i>						
Professors	Scott Baier	77%		15%	8%		77%
	Ken Leonard	65%	8%	23%	4%		73%
Mentor Teacher	Debbie Henney	85%	15%				100%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	58%	23%	15%	4%		81%
	Simulations	81%	15%	4%			96%
Program Organization		62%	31%	7%			93%
Residence Halls		58%	8%	15%	12%	4%	66%
Food		85%	11%				96%
			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			37%	48%	4%		

Table 7. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Boulder, CO</b>							
	<i>29 Participants</i>						
Professors	Carlos Asarta	69%	21%	10%			90%
	John Brock	69%	28%	3%			97%
Mentor Teacher	Tom Lampe	52%	34%	14%			86%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	38%	31%	24%	7%		69%
	Simulations	52%	31%	17%			83%
Program Organization		55%	24%	21%			79%
Residence Halls		7%	3%	28%	24%	3%	10%
Food		21%	36%	39%	4%		57%
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
			29%	43%	29%		
		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Seattle, WA</b>							
	<i>24 Participants</i>						
Professors	Ken Leonard	63%	25%	12%			88%
	Dan Benjamin	83%	17%				100%
Mentor Teacher	Alice Temnick	71%	17%	12%			88%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	58%	29%	13%			87%
	Simulations	38%	50%	8%	4%		88%
Program Organization		67%	21%	13%			88%
Residence Halls			13%	43%	22%	9%	13%
Food		33%	50%	8%	8%		83%
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
			29%	54%	13%		

Table 7. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Hillsdale, MI</b>							
	<i>28 Participants</i>						
Professors	Gary Wolfram	57%	39%	4%			96%
	Roger Butters	93%	7%				100%
Mentor Teacher	John Kessler	75%	25%				100%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	68%	32%				100%
	Simulations	71%	25%	4%			96%
Program Organization		75%	18%	7%			93%
Residence Halls		39%	39%	4%			78%
Food		34%	24%	17%	14%		59%
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
			43%	32%	25%		
		<b>Exceptio nal</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Boston, MA</b>							
	<i>19 Participants</i>						
Professors	John Brock	47%	42%	11%			89%
	Ken Leonard	48%	47%	5%			95%
Mentor Teacher	Malhaz Jiblazde	68%	21%	11%			89%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	37%	47%	16%			84%
	Simulations	63%	26%	11%			89%
Program Organization		32%	58%	5%			90%
Residence Halls			5%	32%	47%	5%	5%
Food			35%	41%	24%		35%
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
			50%	33%	11%		

Table 7. Economics for Leaders  
 Teacher Evaluations of Individual Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

		<b>Excep- tional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Chicago, IL</b>							
	<i>26 Participants</i>						
Professors	Tomas Cvrcek	62%	27%	8%			89%
	Pat Fishe	62%	31%	4%			93%
Mentor Teacher	John Kessler	69%	23%	4%			92%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	38%	42%	15%			80%
	Simulations	46%	42%	12%			88%
Program Organization		38%	50%	8%	4%		88%
Residence Halls		8%	4%	27%	38%	12%	12%
Food		8%	27%	46%	15%	4%	35%
			<b>Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Some- what</b>	<b>No</b>		
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			26%	59%	15%		

Table 8. Economics for Leaders  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011 Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	81%	19%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	71%	23%		
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)	3%			97%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	100%			

**As a Result of the Program**

(all)	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	68%	30%		
Increased Confidence	70%	24%	3%	
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	38%	38%	22%	

**Recommended Program**

(all)	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have Recommended Program or Materials	81%	3%

\*Based on 37 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 9a. Economic Forces in American History  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<b>Overall*</b>	<i>129 Participants</i>						
<b>Sessions</b>	Stimulated Interest	75%	21%	3%	1%		96%
	Clear Content	66%	30%	4%	1%		96%
	Challenging Content	60%	32%	6%	1%	0%	92%
	Helpful Handouts	63%	29%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	12%	3%	1%		96%
<b>Overall</b>	Recommend Program	86%	12%	2%	0%		98%
	Improve Teaching	76%	19%	5%	1%		95%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Instructors</b>	Overall	71%	19%	8%	1%	1%	90%
<b>Program</b>	Lectures	56%	30%	13%	1%	1%	85%
	Simulations	55%	34%	11%	0%		88%
	Organization	63%	29%	8%			92%
	Materials	53%	36%	11%			89%
	Site	64%	19%	12%	3%	1%	83%
				<b>Yes, Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Yes, Somewhat</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Changed Understanding of Government's Role</b>				58%	32%	6%	

\*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 9a. Economic Forces in American History  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Boston, MA		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>46 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	52%	48%				100%
	Challenging Content	54%	39%	7%			93%
	Helpful Handouts	42%	43%	15%			85%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	85%	13%	2%			98%
	Improve Teaching	61%	35%	4%			96%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Lee Alston	70%	17%	11%			87%
	John Wallis	59%	29%	13%			88%
	David Mathews	77%	17%	4%			94%
Program	Curriculum-Lectures	48%	39%	11%			87%
	Curriculum-Simulations	44%	43%	11%			87%
	Organization	50%	39%	7%			89%
	Materials	39%	41%	13%			80%
	Site	22%	28%	28%	9%	2%	50%
				Yes, Quite a Bit	Yes, Somewhat	No	
Changed Understanding of Government's Role				43%	50%	7%	

Table 9a. Economic Forces in American History  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

St. Louis, MO		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
40 Participants							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	8%	2%		90%
	Clear Content	55%	35%	8%	2%		90%
	Challenging Content	58%	35%	3%	3%	1%	93%
	Helpful Handouts	63%	28%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	23%	10%	2%		87%
Overall	Recommend Program	73%	23%	3%	1%		96%
	Improve Teaching	75%	18%	5%	2%		93%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Pamela Nickless	35%	30%	18%	8%	8%	65%
	Martha Olney	55%	25%	18%	2%		80%
	Debbie Henney	55%	35%	8%	2%		90%
Program	Curriculum-Lectures	35%	33%	28%	4%		68%
	Curriculum-Simulations	43%	33%	23%	1%		76%
	Organization	65%	23%	10%			88%
	Materials	43%	43%	10%			86%
	Site	78%	18%				96%
				Yes, Quite a Bit	Yes, Somewhat	No	
Changed Understanding of Government's Role				48%	28%	13%	

Table 9a. Economic Forces in American History  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Williamsburg, VA</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>43 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	86%	12%	2%			98%
	Clear Content	91%	5%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	68%	23%	9%			91%
	Helpful Handouts	84%	16%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	98%	2%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	98%	2%				100%
	Improve Teaching	93%	2%	5%			95%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Pamela Nickless	93%	5%				98%
	Martha Olney	93%	7%				100%
	Debbie Henney	93%	5%				98%
Program	Curriculum-Lectures	82%	16%			2%	98%
	Curriculum-Simulations	75%	23%				98%
	Organization	70%	21%	5%			91%
	Materials	70%	19%	7%			89%
	Site	84%	7%	5%			91%
				<b>Yes, Quite a Bit</b>	<b>Yes, Somewhat</b>	<b>No</b>	
Changed Understanding of Government's Role				79%	14%		

Table 9b. Economic Forces in American History One-Day Program  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Overall*</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>156 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	74%	23%	2%			98%
	Clear Content	71%	27%	1%	1%		98%
	Challenging Content	46%	42%	12%			88%
	Helpful Handouts	59%	31%	9%	1%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	18%	1%			99%
	Recommend Program	75%	22%	3%			97%
	Improve Teaching	66%	32%	2%		0%	98%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Overall	65%	26%	7%	1%	0%	91%
Program	Overall Program	58%	36%	4%	2%		94%
	Materials--presentation	52%	39%	8%	1%		91%
	Program Site	66%	29%	5%	1%		94%

\*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 9b. Economic Forces in American History One-Day Program  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Tuscon, AZ (2011)</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>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	71%	25%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	58%	42%				100%
	Challenging Content	38%	29%	33%			67%
	Helpful Handouts	46%	38%	16%			84%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	13%	4%			96%
Overall	Recommend Program	54%	38%	8%			92%
	Improve Teaching	67%	33%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Pamela Nickless	67%	29%	4%			96%
	Debbie Henney	67%	25%	8%			92%
Program	Overall	50%	33%	8%	4%		83%
	Materials	46%	29%	17%	4%		75%
	Site	63%	21%	8%			84%
<b>Denver, CO (2011)</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>29 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	76%	21%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	83%	14%		3%		97%
	Challenging Content	63%	34%	3%			97%
	Helpful Handouts	76%	21%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	93%	7%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	90%	7%	3%			97%
	Improve Teaching	79%	21%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Ann Carlos	66%	17%	14%	3%		83%
	Debbie Henney	86%	14%				100%
Program	Overall	66%	31%	3%			97%
	Materials	66%	28%	3%	3%		94%
	Site	76%	21%	3%			97%

Table 9b. Economic Forces in American History One-Day Program  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Flemington, NJ (2011)</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>41 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	76%	24%				100%
	Clear Content	59%	39%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	27%	56%	17%			83%
	Helpful Handouts	44%	44%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	29%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	68%	29%	3%			97%
	Improve Teaching	44%	49%	5%		2%	93%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	John Wallis	41%	51%	8%			92%
	Debbie Henney	49%	37%	14%			86%
Program	Overall	49%	41%	10%			90%
	Materials	46%	37%	17%			83%
	Site	51%	34%	12%	3%		85%
<b>Rockford, IL</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>22 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	68%	27%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	82%	18%				100%
	Challenging Content	41%	50%	9%			91%
	Helpful Handouts	55%	27%	14%	5%		82%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	77%	18%	5%			95%
	Improve Teaching	68%	32%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Debbie Henney	68%	18%	5%	5%	4%	86%
	David Mathews	64%	27%	9%			91%
Program	Overall	59%	36%		5%		95%
	Materials	36%	55%	5%			91%
	Site	55%	36%				91%

Table 9b. Economic Forces in American History One-Day Program  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Flemington, NJ</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>40 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	80%	20%				100%
	Clear Content	70%	28%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	60%	35%	5%			95%
	Helpful Handouts	63%	25%	2%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	78%	23%				101%
	Improve Teaching	73%	25%	2%			98%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Debbie Henney	70%	20%	8%	2%		90%
	David Mathews	75%	23%	2%			98%
Program	Overall	60%	33%	2%			93%
	Materials	60%	38%				98%
	Site	73%	25%	2%			98%

Table 10. Economic Forces in American History  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011 Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	79%	21%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	85%	15%		
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)	2%			98%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	92%	8%		

**As a Result of the Program**

(all)	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	71%	28%	2%	
Increased Confidence	66%	33%	2%	
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	34%	48%	16%	

**Recommended Program**

(all)	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have Recommended Program or Materials	86%	2%

\*Based on 58 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 11. Environment and the Economy  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall*		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>182 Participants</i>							
<b>Sessions</b>	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%		0%		100%
	Clear Content	77%	21%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	65%	27%	7%	2%		92%
	Helpful Handouts	77%	20%	3%	0%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	87%	11%	2%		1%	98%
	Recommend Program	90%	9%	1%		0%	98%
	Improved Teaching	82%	16%	2%			98%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<b>Instructors</b>	Overall	75%	21%	5%	0%		95%
<b>Program</b>	Format	65%	27%	6%	2%		92%
	Materials-Presentation	59%	32%	9%	1%		91%
	Program Site	55%	26%	16%	3%		81%

\* Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 11. Environment and the Economy  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Gatlinburg, TN</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>30 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	80%	17%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	80%	17%	3%			97%
	Helpful Handouts	80%	7%	10%	3%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	93%		7%			93%
	Recommend Program	90%	7%			3%	97%
	Improved Teaching	83%	14%	3%			97%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Bob Reinke	80%	10%	10%			90%
Program							
	Format	63%	20%	10%	7%		83%
	Materials-Presentation	63%	17%	13%	4%		80%
	Program Site	57%	27%	13%	3%		84%
<b>Irvington, VA</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>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	90%	10%				100%
	Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
	Challenging Content	81%	13%	3%	3%		94%
	Helpful Handouts	87%	13%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
	Recommend Program	97%		3%			97%
	Improved Teaching	84%	13%	3%			97%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	84%	13%				97%
	Bradley Hobbs	77%	16%	4%			93%
Program							
	Format	68%	26%	3%			94%
	Materials-Presentation	58%	32%	7%			90%
	Program Site	71%	19%	7%			90%

Table 11. Environment and the Economy  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Breckinridge, CO</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>28 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	70%	30%				100%
	Clear Content	50%	43%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	43%	37%	17%	3%		80%
	Helpful Handouts	60%	33%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	30%	3%			97%
	Recommend Program	80%	20%				100%
	Improved Teaching	70%	30%				100%
<b>Instructors</b>		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Don Fell	57%	37%	6%			94%
	Art Woolf	54%	33%	13%			87%
<b>Program</b>							
	Format	40%	50%	10%			90%
	Materials-Presentation	30%	50%	17%			80%
	Program Site	53%	30%	17%			83%
<b>St. Augustine, FL</b>		<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	81%	19%				100%
	Clear Content	77%	23%				100%
	Challenging Content	69%	31%				100%
	Helpful Handouts	85%	15%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
	Recommend Program	92%	8%				100%
	Improved Teaching	88%	8%	4%			96%
<b>Instructors</b>		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
	Don Fell	81%	15%		4%		96%
	Robert Reinke	69%	19%	12%			88%
<b>Program</b>							
	Format	65%	27%	8%			92%
	Program Materials	65%	27%	8%			92%
	Program Site	50%	19%	27%	4%		69%

Table 11. Environment and the Economy  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Mackinac Island, MI (2011)</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>23 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	70%	30%				100%
	Challenging Content	39%	48%	13%			87%
	Helpful Handouts	78%	22%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	13%			4%	96%
	Recommend Program	91%	5%	4%			96%
	Improved Teaching	83%	13%	4%			96%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	78%	22%				100%
	David Dieterle	61%	35%	4%			96%
Program	Format	87%	13%				100%
	Program Materials	61%	39%				100%
	Program Site	87%	13%				100%
<b>Kona, HI (2011)</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>17 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	29%	6%	6%		88%
	Helpful Handouts	65%	35%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	82%	18%				100%
	Improved Teaching	71%	29%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	71%	29%				100%
	Brad Hobbs	76%	18%	6%			94%
Program	Format	65%	18%	17%			83%
	Program Materials	59%	24%	17%			83%
	Program Site	53%	29%	18%			82%

Table 11. Environment and the Economy  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Jacksonville, FL (2011)</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>9 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	78%	11%	11%			89%
	Helpful Handouts	100%					100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Improved Teaching	89%	11%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	100%					100%
	David Dieterle	89%	11%				100%
Program	Format	67%	33%				100%
	Program Materials	89%	11%				100%
	Program Site	44%	44%		11%		88%
<b>Tuscon, AZ (2011)</b>		<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	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	83%	17%				100%
	Challenging Content	72%	22%	6%			94%
	Helpful Handouts	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
	Recommend Program	89%	11%				100%
	Improved Teaching	94%	6%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	89%	11%				100%
	Brad Hobbs	78%	22%				100%
Program	Format	67%	28%		5%		95%
	Program Materials	61%	39%				100%
	Program Site	28%	39%	33%			67%

Table 12. Environment and the Economy  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011 Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	71%	29%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	86%	14%		
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)	2%			98%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	100%			

**As a Result of the Program**

(all)	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	69%	31%		
Increased Confidence	53%	47%		
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	30%	52%	14%	4%

**Recommended Program**

(all)	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have Recommended Program or Materials	98%	2%

\*Based on 45 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 13. Issues of International Trade  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>51 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
	Challenging Content	49%	36%	10%	6%		85%
	Helpful Handouts	59%	30%	10%	2%		88%
	Responsive Instructors	98%	2%				100%
	Recommend Program	90%	10%				100%
	Improve Teaching	84%	14%	2%			98%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Overall	84%	14%	2%			98%
Program	Overall Program	77%	16%	6%			92%
	Materials--presentation	75%	23%	2%			98%
	Program Site	63%	31%	6%			94%

Table 13. Issues of International Trade  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Middelburg, FL</b>		<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	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
	Challenging Content	77%	12%	8%	4%		89%
	Helpful Handouts	69%	15%	12%	4%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	96%	4%				100%
	Recommend Program	92%	8%				100%
	Improve Teaching	92%	8%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Carlos Asarta	92%	8%				100%
	Kathy Ratte	77%	19%	4%			96%
Program	Overall Program	77%	19%				96%
	Materials--presentation	77%	23%				100%
	Program Site	62%	31%	7%			93%
<b>Newark, DE</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>25 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
	Clear Content	92%	8%				100%
	Challenging Content	20%	60%	12%	8%		80%
	Helpful Handouts	48%	45%	8%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Teaching	76%	20%	4%			96%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Carlos Asarta	88%	12%				100%
	Kathy Ratte	80%	16%	4%			96%
Program	Overall Program	76%	12%	12%			88%
	Materials--presentation	72%	24%	4%			96%
	Program Site	64%	32%	4%			96%

Table 14. Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Vancouver		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
29 Participants							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	79%	10%	7%		4%	89%
	Clear Content	79%	17%			4%	96%
	Challenging Content	55%	31%	10%		4%	86%
	Helpful Handouts	59%	21%	17%		3%	80%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	17%			4%	96%
	Recommend Program	76%	10%	4%	4%	6%	86%
	Improve Teaching	62%	28%	4%	3%	3%	90%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Ken Leonard	59%	31%	7%			90%
	Kathy Ratte	62%	31%	7%			93%
Program	Overall	45%	34%	17%	4%		79%
	Materials--presentation	41%	41%	7%	7%		82%
	Program Site	45%	31%	10%	4%		76%
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
"Capitalism is good for the poor"		38%	45%	14%		3%	83%
Agreement before workshop		14%	24%	45%	10%	7%	38%

Table 15. Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?  
 Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011  
 Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	73%	27%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	90%			
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)				100%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	100%			

**As a Result of the Program**  
(all)

	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	18%	82%		
Increased Confidence	30%	70%		
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	27%	55%	18%	

**Recommended Program**  
(all)

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have Recommended Program or Materials	100%	

\*Based on 11 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 16. The Economics of Disasters  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Toronto, ON		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>27 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	59%	37%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	74%	22%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	41%	33%	26%			74%
	Helpful Handouts	22%	44%	26%	8%		66%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	19%	3%			97%
	Recommend Program	56%	41%		3%		97%
	Improve Teaching	70%	19%	8%	3%		89%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Ken Leonard	41%	26%	30%			67%
	John Kessler	48%	37%	11%			85%
Program	Overall Program	33%	44%	19%			77%
	Materials--presentation	26%	37%	37%			63%
	Program Site	15%	11%	44%	15%	4%	26%
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SD+D
"Disasters are good for the economy"			4%	15%	26%	44%	70%
Agreement before workshop		15%	26%	19%	26%	8%	34%

Table 17. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Overall*</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>113 Participants</i>							
<b>Sessions</b>	Stimulated Interest	86%	13%	1%			99%
	Clear Content	83%	16%		1%		99%
	Challenging Content	60%	31%	8%	1%		91%
	Helpful Handouts	60%	29%	10%	1%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%	1%			99%
	Recommend Program	90%	9%		1%		99%
	Improve Teaching	80%	19%	1%		1%	98%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Instructors</b>	Overall	77%	20%	3%		0%	97%
<b>Program</b>	Overall Program	63%	28%	8%	1%		91%
	Format	61%	32%	6%	1%		93%
	Materials-Presentation	60%	31%	8%		1%	91%
	Program Site	67%	25%	7%	1%		92%

\* Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 17. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Santa Barbara, CA</b>		<b>Strongly</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
		<b>Agree</b>				<b>Disagree</b>	
<i>30 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	93%	7%				100%
	Clear Content	87%	13%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	20%	10%	3%		87%
	Helpful Handouts	60%	30%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	97%	3%				100%
	Recommend Program	97%	3%				100%
	Improve Teaching	83%	17%				100%
		<b>Exceptio</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
		<b>nal</b>					
Instructors	Ken Leonard	90%	10%				100%
	Kathy Ratte	97%	3%				100%
Program	Economic Demise of the Soviet Union	67%	33%				100%
	Issues of International Trade	80%	20%				100%
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?	83%	10%	4%			93%
	Economics of Water	67%	27%	4%			94%
	Format	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Materials-Presentation	77%	23%				100%
	Program Site	90%	10%				100%

Table 17. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Arlington, VA								
		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	
22 Participants								
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	91%	9%					100%
	Clear Content	100%						100%
	Challenging Content	55%	36%	9%				91%
	Helpful Handouts	55%	32%	13%				87%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%					100%
	Recommend Program	95%	5%					100%
	Improve Teaching	86%	14%					100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>	
Instructors	Ken Leonard	73%	23%	4%			96%	
	Kathy Ratte	73%	27%				100%	
Program	Economic Demise of the Soviet Union	77%	18%	5%			95%	
	Issues of International Trade	50%	36%	14%			86%	
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?	82%	18%				100%	
	Economics of Water	55%	23%	4%			78%	
	Format	68%	23%	5%			91%	
	Materials-Presentation	55%	41%	6%			96%	
	Program Site	50%	41%	5%	4%		91%	

Table 17. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Cleveland, OH		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
29 Participants							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	34%	7%			93%
	Helpful Handouts	66%	31%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	14%				100%
	Recommend Program	90%	10%				100%
	Improve Teaching	76%	24%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Ken Leonard	48%	45%	7%			93%
	Kathy Ratte	76%	24%				100%
Program	Economic Demise of the Soviet Union	52%	41%	7%			93%
	Issues of International Trade	48%	38%	14%			86%
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?	49%	41%	10%			90%
	Economics of Water	55%	31%	14%			86%
	Format	52%	38%	10%			90%
	Materials-Presentation	56%	34%	10%			90%
	Program Site	48%	34%	14%			82%

Table 17. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Scottsdale, AZ (2011)		Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	SA+A
		Agree				Disagree	
32 Participants							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	78%	19%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	75%	22%		3%		97%
	Challenging Content	59%	34%	7%			93%
	Helpful Handouts	59%	25%	13%	3%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	6%	3%			97%
	Recommend Program	81%	16%		3%		97%
	Improve Teaching	75%	19%	3%		3%	94%
		Exceptio	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
		nal					
Instructors	Ken Leonard	63%	25%	9%		3%	88%
	Kathy Ratte	91%	6%	3%			97%
Program	Economic Demise of the Soviet Union	63%	25%	13%			88%
	Issues of International Trade	53%	31%	9%	6%		84%
	Is Capitalism Good for the Poor?	75%	16%	6%	3%		91%
	Economics of Water	44%	34%	16%	6%		78%
	Format	50%	41%	3%	3%		91%
	Materials-Presentation	53%	28%	16%		3%	81%
	Program Site	72%	19%	9%			91%

Table 18. Teaching Economic Issues  
 Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011 Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	88%	12%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	80%	20%		
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)				100%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	100%			

**As a Result of the Program**

(all)				
	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	76%	18%	6%	
Increased Confidence	76%	18%	6%	
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	59%	24%	18%	

**Recommended Program**

(all)		
Have Recommended Program or Materials	<b>Yes</b> 88%	<b>No</b> 13%

\*Based on 17 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 19. Right Start  
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Overall*</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA+A</b>
<i>52 Participants</i>							
<b>Sessions</b>	Stimulated Interest	71%	25%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	77%	23%				100%
	Challenging Content	73%	25%	2%			98%
	Helpful Handouts	56%	40%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
	Recommend Program	85%	15%				100%
	Improve Teaching	85%	15%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
<b>Instructors</b>	Overall	72%	28%	1%			99%
<b>Program</b>	Overall Program	52%	46%	2%			98%
	Format	42%	48%	10%			90%
	Materials-Presentation	44%	46%	8%			90%
	Program Site	37%	46%	14%	2%		83%

\* Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 19. Right Start  
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

<b>Franklin, TN</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>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	61%	35%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
	Challenging Content	74%	26%				100%
	Helpful Handouts	58%	35%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
	Recommend Program	84%	16%				100%
	Improved Teaching	81%	19%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	81%	19%				100%
	Bradley Hobbs	71%	26%	3%			97%
	Noreen Lephardt	74%	26%				100%
Program	Overall Program	58%	39%	3%			97%
	Format	42%	45%	13%			87%
	Materials-Presentation	48%	45%	7%			93%
	Program Site	39%	45%	16%			84%
<b>Honolulu, HI</b>		<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	86%	10%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	81%	19%				100%
	Challenging Content	71%	24%	5%			95%
	Helpful Handouts	52%	48%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	33%				100%
	Recommend Program	86%	14%				100%
	Improve Teaching	90%	10%				100%
		<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Superb</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructors	Don Fell	71%	29%				100%
	Bradley Hobbs	57%	43%				100%
Program	Overall Program	43%	57%				100%
	Format	43%	52%	5%			95%
	Materials-Presentation	38%	48%	10%			86%
	Program Site	33%	48%	10%	5%		81%

Table 20. Economics Online for Teachers Part 1  
Teacher Evaluations

**Fall 2011**

<i>24 Participants</i>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	42%	46%	8%		4%	88%
Content Clear	29%	54%	13%	4%		83%
Challenging Content	50%	38%	8%			88%
Responsive Instructor	63%	33%				96%
Timely Return of Assignments	75%	25%				100%
Recommend Course	50%	29%	13%	4%	4%	79%
Improve Teaching	50%	25%	17%	4%		75%

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	50%	38%	13%			88%
Lectures	4%	54%	33%	4%	4%	58%
Activities and activity videos	13%	58%	25%		4%	71%
Assignments	8%	42%	33%	8%	8%	50%
Materials	21%	46%	21%	8%	4%	67%
Discussion Boards	13%	42%	38%	8%		55%

**Winter 2012**

<i>20 Participants</i>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	50%	35%	15%			85%
Clear Content	45%	40%	10%	5%		85%
Challenging Content	60%	35%	5%			95%
Responsive Instructor	65%	35%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	60%	40%				100%
Recommend Course	45%	45%	10%			90%
Improve Teaching	40%	55%	5%			95%

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	30%	55%	15%			85%
Lectures	10%	50%	40%			60%
Activities	30%	30%	35%	5%		60%
Assignments	15%	35%	30%	15%	5%	50%
Materials	30%	35%	30%	5%		65%
Discussion Boards	15%	35%	30%	20%		50%

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

	<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
Fall 2011	71.6%	82.1%	10.5%
Winter 2012	81.3%	82.5%	1.2%
Overall	76.5%	82.3%	5.8%

Table 21. Economics Online for Teachers Part 2  
Teacher Evaluations

**Spring 2012**  
25 Participants

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	58%	42%				100%
Clear Content	50%	50%				100%
Challenging Content	33%	63%	4%			96%
Responsive Instructor	46%	42%			4%	88%
Timely Return of Assignments	8%	50%	29%	8%	4%	58%
Recommend Course	54%	46%				100%
Improve Teaching	42%	50%	4%			92%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	13%	42%	38%	4%	4%	55%
Lectures	25%	54%	21%			79%
Activities	21%	63%	13%	4%		84%
Assignments	8%	46%	42%		4%	54%
Materials	17%	67%	17%			84%
Discussion Boards	21%	25%	38%	13%	4%	46%

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
73.5%	86.0%	12.5%

Table 22. Economics Online for Teachers  
Follow-Up Teacher Questionnaire for 2011  
Programs

**Use of Materials**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Taught Course Containing Economic Content Since Taking Course	67%	33%		
Have Used Materials (Of those who have taught economics)	100%			
	<b>Do Not Fit</b>	<b>Teach AP</b>	<b>Do Not Like</b>	<b>Other Reason</b>
Reason Have Not Used Materials (of those not using)				100%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>		
Plan to Use Materials (Of those who have not taught economics since taking FTE course)	100%			

**As a Result of the Program**

(all)				
	<b>Very Much</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	
Increased Enthusiasm	50%	50%		
Increased Confidence	67%	17%		
	<b>Much Better</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Student Understanding of Economic Principles	50%	33%	17%	

**Recommended Program**

(all)	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Have Recommended Program or Materials	83%	17%

\*Based on 6 respondents. Some percentages may not total 100% due to non-response.

Table 23. Economics of Disasters Online  
Teacher Evaluations

**Winter 2012**  
26 Participants

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	46%	50%	4%			96%
Clear Content	38%	54%		4%	4%	92%
Challenging Content	50%	46%	4%			96%
Responsive Instructor	46%	38%	4%	4%		84%
Timely Return of Assignments	42%	42%	15%			84%
Recommend Course	50%	38%	4%	8%		88%
Improve Teaching	35%	46%	12%	4%		81%
	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	35%	46%	15%			81%
Lectures	19%	54%	19%	8%		73%
Activities and activity videos	27%	46%	19%	8%		73%
Assignments	31%	38%	27%	4%		69%
Materials	35%	46%	19%			81%
Discussion Boards	15%	38%	23%	15%	4%	53%
<b>Pre- and Post-test Results</b>	<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>			
	54.9%	82.5%	27.6%			

Table 24. Is Capitalism Good for the Poor Online  
Teacher Evaluations

Fall 2011

19 Participants

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	53%	37%	5%		5%	90%
Clear Content	68%	26%			5%	94%
Challenging Content	21%	74%				95%
Responsive Instructor	89%	11%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	89%	11%				100%
Recommend Course	58%	37%			5%	95%
Improve Teaching	58%	37%			5%	95%

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	63%	32%		5%		95%
Lectures	21%	47%	21%	5%	5%	68%
Activities and activity videos	21%	53%	16%	5%	5%	74%
Assignments	37%	32%	26%		5%	69%
Materials	37%	47%	11%			84%
Discussion Boards	21%	37%	26%	11%	5%	58%

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
70.0%	87.2%	17.2%

Table 25. Is Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online  
Teacher Evaluations

**Spring 2012**  
23 Participants

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>SA + A</b>
Stimulated Interest	61%	39%				100%
Clear Content	39%	61%				100%
Challenging Content	43%	52%	4%			95%
Responsive Instructor	48%	39%	9%	4%		87%
Timely Return of Assignments	30%	57%		9%		87%
Recommend Course	52%	48%				100%
Improve Teaching	43%	52%	4%			95%

	<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>E+S</b>
Instructor Overall	57%	35%	9%			92%
Lectures	2%	22%	9%			24%
Activities and activity videos	26%	52%	17%	4%		78%
Assignments	13%	52%	21%	9%		65%
Materials	39%	39%	13%	9%		78%
Discussion Boards	22%	26%	35%	17%		48%

**Pre- and Post-test Results**

<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
73.0%	76.0%	3.0%