

Table 1. Economics for Leaders
Student Performance on Achievement Test

	Percent Correct
Houston, TX	78
Boulder, CO	75
Los Angeles, CA	74
New Haven, CT (1)	85
Berkeley, CA	75
New Haven, CT (2)	85
Durham, NC	79
Gainesville, FL	72
Ithaca, NY	86
Chicago, IL	84
St. Louis, MO	75
Providence, RI	83
Seattle, WA	73
Overall*	79
<i>National Average (2012)</i>	<i>53</i>

*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 2. Economics for Leaders
Pre-Test Results

	Percent Correct
Houston, TX	73
Boulder, CO	65
Los Angeles, CA	71
New Haven, CT (1)	72
Berkeley, CA	61
New Haven, CT (2)	72
Durham, NC	65
Gainesville, FL	56
Ithaca, NY	65
Chicago, IL	71
St. Louis, MO	59
Providence, RI	67
Seattle, WA	61
Overall Percent*	66

*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Overall*		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
<i>433 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	31%	49%	13%	3%	0%	80%
	Clear Content	55%	37%	7%	0%		91%
	Challenging Content	43%	44%	11%	2%		87%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	27%	7%	2%	0%	91%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	57%	30%	9%	3%	1%	87%
	Clear Content	57%	33%	8%	2%	1%	90%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	21%	3%	1%	0%	96%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	32%	7%	2%	0%	91%
	Improve Understanding	42%	44%	11%	2%	0%	86%

*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Houston, TX							
<i>29 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	52%	45%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	41%	48%	10%			90%
	Challenging Content	7%	62%	28%	3%		69%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	34%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	69%	28%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	59%	41%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	21%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	34%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	48%	41%	10%			90%
Boulder, CO							
<i>27 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	44%	22%	33%			67%
	Clear Content	63%	33%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	41%	48%	11%			89%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	74%	22%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	56%	41%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	33%	7%			93%
	Improve Understanding	70%	26%		4%		96%
Los Angeles, CA							
<i>37 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	61%	34%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	76%	21%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	79%	18%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	86%	8%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	51%	32%	14%	3%		84%
	Clear Content	51%	46%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	14%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	69%	29%		3%		97%
	Improve Understanding	54%	43%	3%			97%
New Haven, CT (1)							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	38%	49%	5%	5%	3%	87%
	Clear Content	64%	33%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	51%	44%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	18%	8%	3%		90%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	44%	36%	10%	5%	5%	79%
	Clear Content	51%	28%	8%	5%	8%	79%
	Responsive Instructors	51%	21%	10%	15%	3%	72%
Overall	Recommend Program	54%	28%	13%	3%	3%	82%
	Improve Understanding	50%	47%	3%			97%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Berkeley, CA							
<i>34 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	35%	59%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	35%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	18%	9%			91%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	65%	32%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	76%	18%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	82%	15%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	56%	29%	15%			85%
New Haven, CT (2)							
<i>38 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	47%	53%				100%
	Clear Content	74%	24%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	53%	42%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	32%	34%	29%	5%		66%
	Clear Content	39%	47%	11%		3%	87%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	32%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	50%	34%	16%			84%
	Improve Understanding	32%	55%	11%	3%		87%
Durham, NC							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	50%	47%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	81%	16%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	59%	41%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	56%	31%	9%	3%		88%
	Clear Content	63%	22%	16%			84%
	Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	69%	28%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	59%	28%	9%	3%		88%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Gainesville, FL							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	6%	75%	19%			81%
	Clear Content	34%	59%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	31%	56%	13%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	66%	28%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	47%	41%	6%	6%		88%
	Clear Content	50%	38%	13%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	38%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	47%	41%	9%	3%		88%
	Improve Understanding	34%	53%	13%			88%
Ithaca, NY							
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	16%	47%	38%			63%
	Clear Content	24%	36%	19%	3%		60%
	Challenging Content	22%	47%	25%	6%		69%
	Responsive Instructors	28%	34%	22%	16%		63%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	66%	25%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	75%	19%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	9%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	69%	22%	6%	3%		91%
	Improve Understanding	28%	56%	16%			84%
Chicago, IL							
<i>30 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	32%	57%	11%			89%
	Clear Content	55%	41%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	52%	38%	7%	3%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	62%	28%	10%			90%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	41%	38%	10%	7%	3%	79%
	Clear Content	52%	34%	7%	7%		86%
	Responsive Instructors	69%	28%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	48%	38%	7%	3%	3%	86%
	Improve Understanding	41%	38%	17%	3%		79%
St. Louis, MO							
<i>33 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	30%	52%	12%	6%		82%
	Clear Content	55%	33%	12%			88%
	Challenging Content	33%	55%	9%	3%		88%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	34%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	76%	18%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	67%	33%	0%			100%
	Responsive Instructors	75%	25%	0%			100%
Overall	Recommend Program	61%	33%	3%	3%		94%
	Improve Understanding	24%	64%	6%	6%		88%

Table 3. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Providence, RI							
<i>40 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	13%	49%	26%	10%	3%	62%
	Clear Content	26%	59%	15%			85%
	Challenging Content	13%	59%	23%	5%		72%
	Responsive Instructors	41%	33%	15%	8%	3%	74%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	72%	23%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	54%	28%	18%			82%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	15%	0%			100%
Overall	Recommend Program	56%	38%	5%			95%
	Improve Understanding	26%	41%	23%	8%	3%	67%
Seattle, WA							
<i>31 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	25%	50%	19%	6%		75%
	Clear Content	44%	47%	9%			91%
	Challenging Content	53%	25%	16%	6%		78%
	Responsive Instructors	41%	56%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	34%	13%	3%		84%
	Clear Content	52%	32%	13%	3%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	61%	29%	10%			90%
Overall	Recommend Program	39%	42%	16%	3%		81%
	Improve Understanding	35%	42%	19%	3%		77%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall*						
<i>433 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	53%	32%	11%	3%	1%	85%
Leadership Team	65%	26%	7%	2%	1%	91%
Program Coordinators	64%	26%	8%	1%	1%	90%
Residence Halls	27%	23%	27%	14%	9%	50%
Food	24%	29%	29%	14%	5%	53%
Recreational Activities	36%	36%	21%	6%	1%	72%

*Overall percentages are weighted averages.

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

Houston, TX	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>29 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	60%	28%	12%			88%
Leadership Team	76%	21%	3%			97%
Program Coordinators	41%	21%	34%		3%	62%
Residence Halls	41%	21%	34%		3%	62%
Food	38%	34%	17%	3%	7%	72%
Recreational Activities	41%	24%	24%	10%		66%
Boulder, CO	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>27 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	52%	29%	8%	5%	6%	81%
Leadership Team	81%	19%				100%
Program Coordinators	73%	23%	4%			96%
Residence Halls	62%	19%	15%	4%		81%
Food	60%	28%	8%	4%		88%
Recreational Activities	67%	29%	4%			96%
Los Angeles, CA	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>37 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	84%	14%	3%			97%
Leadership Team	57%	27%	11%	5%		84%
Program Coordinators	65%	35%				100%
Residence Halls	24%	38%	35%	3%		62%
Food	49%	24%	22%	5%		73%
Recreational Activities	51%	38%	11%			89%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

New Haven, CT (1) <i>38 Participants</i>	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team	64%	33%	3%			97%
Leadership Team	59%	15%	13%	5%	8%	74%
Program Coordinators	68%	18%	5%	3%	5%	87%
Residence Halls	3%	3%	21%	41%	33%	5%
Food	21%	47%	24%	8%		68%
Recreational Activities	49%	28%	23%			77%
Berkeley, CA <i>34 Participants</i>	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team	68%	24%	9%			91%
Leadership Team	94%	6%				100%
Program Coordinators	88%	12%				100%
Residence Halls	18%	32%	44%	3%	3%	50%
Food	24%	32%	32%	12%		56%
Recreational Activities	29%	44%	21%	6%		74%
New Haven, CT (2) <i>38 Participants</i>	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team	74%	24%	3%			97%
Leadership Team	42%	34%	18%	5%		76%
Program Coordinators	66%	29%	5%			95%
Residence Halls	3%	8%	24%	43%	22%	11%
Food	37%	39%	21%	3%		76%
Recreational Activities	40%	26%	29%	6%		66%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

Durham, NC	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	69%	28%	3%			97%
Leadership Team	68%	26%	6%			94%
Program Coordinators	81%	19%				100%
Residence Halls	28%	31%	34%	6%		59%
Food	16%	16%	38%	28%	3%	31%
Recreational Activities	44%	28%	16%	13%		72%
Gainesville, FL	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	34%	52%	9%	5%		86%
Leadership Team	47%	47%	3%	3%		94%
Program Coordinators	66%	19%	16%			84%
Residence Halls	66%	19%	16%			84%
Food	6%	22%	38%	19%	16%	28%
Recreational Activities	6%	31%	44%	19%		38%
Ithaca, NY	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	28%	28%	38%	6%		56%
Leadership Team	72%	25%	3%			97%
Program Coordinators	59%	31%	9%			91%
Residence Halls	38%	28%	31%	3%		66%
Food	32%	19%	32%	16%		52%
Recreational Activities	43%	37%	17%		3%	80%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

Chicago, IL	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>30 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	41%	45%	7%	3%	3%	86%
Leadership Team	52%	45%	3%			97%
Program Coordinators	48%	45%	7%			93%
Residence Halls	38%	45%	10%	7%		83%
Food	7%	43%	30%	13%	7%	50%
Recreational Activities	21%	52%	17%	7%	3%	72%
St. Louis, MO	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>33 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	56%	32%	6%	6%		88%
Leadership Team	91%	9%				100%
Program Coordinators	53%	38%	6%	3%		91%
Residence Halls	44%	38%	19%			81%
Food	3%	22%	41%	25%	9%	25%
Recreational Activities	16%	48%	26%	6%	3%	65%
Providence, RI	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>40 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	18%	49%	26%	5%	3%	67%
Leadership Team	59%	38%	3%			97%
Program Coordinators	73%	20%	3%	5%		93%
Residence Halls	3%	18%	31%	28%	21%	21%
Food	3%	18%	31%	31%	18%	21%
Recreational Activities	34%	37%	24%	5%		71%

Table 4. Economics for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Accommodations

Seattle, WA	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Participants</i>						
Economics Team	39%	33%	19%	8%	1%	71%
Leadership Team	50%	30%	17%	3%		80%
Program Coordinators	43%	37%	20%			80%
Residence Halls	7%	7%	27%	37%	23%	13%
Food	20%	33%	37%	10%		53%
Recreational Activities	29%	46%	18%	7%		75%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Overall*							
	<i>116 Participants</i>						
Morning	Stimulated Interest	76%	19%	4%		1%	95%
	Clear Content	79%	19%	2%			98%
	Challenging Content	68%	30%	1%	2%		97%
	Helpful Materials	64%	33%	2%	1%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	16%	3%			97%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	61%	35%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	76%	22%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	63%	33%	4%			96%
	Helpful Materials	63%	33%	4%			96%
	Responsive Instructors	84%	14%	1%	1%		98%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	17%	3%			97%
	Improve Teaching	80%	17%	3%			97%

*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Houston, TX							
<i>15 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	75%	19%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	81%	19%				100%
	Challenging Content	73%	27%				100%
	Helpful Materials	73%	27%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	93%	7%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	60%	27%	13%			87%
	Clear Content	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	71%	21%	7%			93%
	Helpful Materials	60%	27%	13%			87%
	Responsive Instructors	93%	7%				93%
Overall	Recommend Program	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Improve Teaching	73%	20%	7%			93%
Boulder, CO							
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
	Clear Content	78%	22%				100%
	Challenging Content	59%	35%	6%			94%
	Helpful Materials	56%	44%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	18%	6%			94%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	59%	41%				100%
	Clear Content	76%	18%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	59%	29%	12%			88%
	Helpful Materials	67%	28%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	82%	18%				100%
	Improve Teaching	82%	18%				100%
Berkeley, CA							
<i>10 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Clear Content	70%	20%	10%			90%
	Challenging Content	80%	20%				100%
	Helpful Materials	50%	30%	10%	10%		80%
	Responsive Instructors	70%	30%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
	Challenging Content	50%	50%				100%
	Helpful Materials	50%	50%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	90%	10%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	80%	20%				100%
	Improve Teaching	80%	20%				100%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Gainesville, FL							
<i>15 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	80%	20%				100%
	Clear Content	87%	13%				100%
	Challenging Content	87%	13%				100%
	Helpful Materials	73%	27%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	87%	13%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	80%	20%				100%
	Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
	Challenging Content	73%	27%				100%
	Helpful Materials	80%	13%	7%			93%
	Responsive Instructors	87%	13%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	87%	13%				100%
	Improve Teaching	87%	13%				100%
Chicago, IL							
<i>19</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	95%	5%				100%
	Clear Content	84%	16%				100%
	Challenging Content	74%	26%				100%
	Helpful Materials	53%	47%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	26%	11%			89%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	47%	53%				100%
	Clear Content	68%	32%				100%
	Challenging Content	58%	37%	5%			95%
	Helpful Materials	47%	47%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	26%		5%		95%
Overall	Recommend Program	79%	21%				100%
	Improve Teaching	79%	21%				100%
St. Louis, MO							
<i>17</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	76%	24%				100%
	Clear Content	82%	18%				100%
	Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
	Helpful Materials	81%	19%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	19%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	75%	19%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	88%	13%				100%
	Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%
	Helpful Materials	69%	31%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	82%	12%	6%			94%
	Improve Teaching	82%	12%	6%			94%

Table 5. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Seattle, WA							
22							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	59%	23%	14%		5%	82%
	Clear Content	73%	23%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	45%	45%		9%		91%
	Helpful Materials	64%	32%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	5%	5%			95%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	59%	36%	5%			95%
	Clear Content	64%	32%	5%			95%
	Challenging Content	55%	41%	5%			95%
	Helpful Materials	64%	36%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	77%	14%	9%			91%
	Improve Teaching	77%	14%	9%			91%

Table 6. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Overall*						
<i>116 Participants</i>						
Professors	63%	29%	8%	1%		92%
Mentor Teachers	78%	19%	3%			97%
Economics Curriculum						
Lectures	53%	30%	14%	2%	1%	83%
Simulations	65%	30%	5%			95%
Program Organiza	63%	29%	7%	2%		91%
Residence Halls	17%	27%	26%	20%	10%	44%
Food	44%	22%	27%	6%		66%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		74%	19%	2%		

*Overall percentage is a weighted average.

Table 6. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Houston, TX						
<i>15 Participants</i>						
Professor	60%	40%				100%
Mentor Teacher	87%	13%				100%
Economics Currici						
Lectures	40%	40%	20%			80%
Simulations	80%	20%				100%
Program Organiza	60%	27%	13%			87%
Residence Halls		36%	36%	29%		36%
Food	73%	13%	13%			87%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		80%	20%			
Boulder, CO						
<i>18 Participants</i>						
Professor	75%	25%				100%
Mentor Teacher	93%	7%				100%
Economics Currici						
Lectures	60%	33%	7%			93%
Simulations	73%	27%				100%
Program Organiza	80%	20%				100%
Residence Halls	42%	50%		8%		92%
Food	73%	20%	7%			93%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		71%	12%			

Table 6. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Excep- tional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Berkeley, CA						
<i>10 Participants</i>						
Professor	50%	20%	30%			70%
Mentor Teacher	80%	20%				100%
Economics Currici						
Lectures	50%	30%	10%		10%	80%
Simulations	80%	20%				100%
Program Organiza	40%	50%	10%			90%
Residence Halls	10%	20%	40%	20%	10%	30%
Food	40%	20%	20%	20%		60%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		89%	11%			
Gainesville, FL						
<i>15 Participants</i>						
Professor	53%	47%				100%
Mentor Teacher	73%	20%	7%			93%
Economics Currici						
Lectures	53%	33%	13%			87%
Simulations	60%	33%	7%			93%
Program Organiza	73%	27%				100%
Residence Halls		27%	47%	27%		27%
Food	13%	40%	33%	13%		53%
		Quite a Bit	Some- what	No		
Changed Understanding		73%	27%			

Table 6. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Chicago, IL						
<i>19 Participants</i>						
Professor	72%	17%	11%			89%
Mentor Teacher	72%	22%	6%			94%
Economics Curricl						
Lectures	67%	28%	6%			94%
Simulations	50%	39%	11%			89%
Program Organiza	67%	28%	6%			94%
Residence Halls	27%	13%	47%	13%		40%
Food	56%	11%	22%	6%	6%	67%
		Quite a Bit	Some-what	No		
Changed Understanding		79%	16%			
St. Louis, MO						
<i>17 Participants</i>						
Professor	71%	24%	6%			94%
Mentor Teacher	88%	12%				100%
Economics Curricl						
Lectures	65%	12%	24%			76%
Simulations	65%	29%	6%			94%
Program Organiza	71%	18%	12%			88%
Residence Halls	27%	36%	18%	18%		64%
Food	29%	24%	47%			53%
		Quite a Bit	Some-what	No		
Changed Understanding		76%	18%	6%		

Table 6. Economics for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Staff Members, Economics Curriculum, and Accommodations

	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Seattle, WA						
<i>22 Participants</i>						
Professor	50%	35%	10%	5%		85%
Professor	63%	26%	11%			89%
Mentor Teacher	55%	35%	10%			
Economics Currici						
Lectures	35%	35%	20%	10%		70%
Simulations	55%	35%	10%			90%
Program Organiza	40%	40%	10%	10%		80%
Residence Halls		5%	5%	25%	55%	5%
Food	28%	28%	44%	11%		56%
		Quite a Bit	Some-what	No		
Changed Understanding		59%	27%	5%		

Table 7. Economic History for Leaders
 Student Evaluations of Sessions, Staff Members, and Accommodations, and
 Performance on Achievement Test

Williamsburg, VA

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
<i>32 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	22%	59%	19%			81%
	Clear Content	16%	63%	13%	9%		78%
	Challenging Content	16%	44%	34%	6%		59%
	Responsive Instructors	31%	56%	13%			88%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	59%	25%	16%			84%
	Clear Content	56%	34%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	38%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	41%	44%	13%	3%		84%
	Improve Understanding	28%	63%	6%	3%		91%

		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team		32%	38%	24%	5%	1%	70%
Leadership Team		63%	31%	6%			94%
Program Coordinators		72%	25%	3%			97%
Residence Halls		22%	41%	34%	3%		63%
Food		6%	19%	47%	25%	3%	25%
Recreational Activities		19%	47%	31%	3%		66%

Nashville, TN

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
<i>23 Participants</i>							
Morning	Stimulated Interest	58%	38%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
	Challenging Content	48%	52%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	83%	13%		4%		96%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	70%	26%	4%			96%
	Clear Content	65%	35%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	43%	48%	9%			91%
	Improve Understanding	48%	52%				100%

		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Team		74%	24%	2%			98%
Leadership Team		83%	17%				100%
Program Coordinators		74%	22%	4%			96%
Residence Halls			22%	65%	4%	9%	22%
Food		30%	30%	39%			61%
Recreational Activities		19%	38%	29%	5%	10%	57%

Pre- and Post-test Results

	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
Williamsburg	47%	69%	22%
Nashville	45%	60%	15%

Table 7. Economic History for Leaders
Student Evaluations of Sessions, Staff Members, and Accommodations, and
Performance on Achievement Test

Table 8. Economic History for Leaders
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Nashville, TN

9 Participants*

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Morning	Stimulated Interest	78%	22%				100%
	Clear Content	78%	22%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%
	Handouts and Materials Helpful	78%	22%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Afternoon	Stimulated Interest	78%	11%	11%			89%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	56%	44%				100%
	Handouts and Materials Helpful	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
Overall	Recommend Program	78%	11%	11%			89%
	Improve Teaching	78%	11%	11%			89%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Professor		78%	22%				100%
Mentor Teacher		78%	11%	11%			89%
Economics Curriculum							
	Lectures	67%	33%				100%
	Simulations	89%	11%				100%
Program Organization		67%		33%			67%
Residence Halls			11%	33%	22%	33%	11%
Food		67%	22%			11%	89%
Changed Understanding of Government's Role			Quite a Bit	Somewhat	No		
			56%	44%			

*Evaluations reflect respondents who completed online survey only.

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

Grand Haven, MI		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>22 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	95%	5%				100%
	Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
	Challenging Content	68%	32%				100%
	Helpful Handouts	86%	14%				100%
	Responsive Instructor	95%	5%				100%
	Recommend Program	95%	5%				100%
	Improved Teaching	95%	5%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors Program	Overall	73%	23%	5%			95%
	Format	73%	27%				100%
	Materials-Presentation	68%	32%				100%
	Program Site	68%	32%				100%
Nashville, TN		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>18 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	89%	6%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	89%	6%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	67%	28%	6%			94%
	Helpful Handouts	72%	28%				100%
	Responsive Instructor	89%	11%				100%
	Recommend Program	89%	11%				100%
	Improved Teaching	89%	11%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors Program	Overall	94%	3%	3%			97%
	Format	67%	28%	6%			94%
	Materials-Presentation	78%	17%	6%			94%
	Program Site	67%	17%	17%			83%

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

Overall		Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	SA+A
		Agree				Disagree	
71 Participants							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	66%	34%				100%
	Binder Useful	68%	30%	3%			97%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	49%	48%	3%			97%
	Well Organized	87%	10%				97%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Would Attend Another	99%					99%
Instructors			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
		Content	79%	18%	3%		
	Presentation		82%	14%			

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

Toronto, ON		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Participants</i>							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	68%	32%				100%
	Binder Useful	77%	19%	3%			97%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	55%	45%				100%
	Well Organized	87%	13%				100%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Would Attend Another	100%					100%
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Instructors	Content		79%	15%	6%		
	Presentation		81%	13%			
Edmonton, AB		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	63%	38%				100%
	Binder Useful	63%	38%				100%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	42%	54%	4%			96%
	Well Organized	92%					92%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Would Attend Another	96%					96%
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Instructors	Content		79%	21%			
	Presentation		79%	17%			
Burnaby, BC (2015)		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>16 Participants</i>							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	69%	31%				100%
	Binder Useful	56%	38%	6%			94%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	50%	44%	6%			94%
	Well Organized	81%	19%				100%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Would Attend Another	100%					100%
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Instructors	Content		78%	19%			
	Presentation		88%	13%			

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

Edmond, OK (2015)		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>49 Participants</i>							
Sessions	Stimulated Interest	36%	48%	16%			84%
	Clear Content	60%	36%	4%			96%
	Challenging Content	31%	38%	24%	7%		69%
	Helpful Handouts	40%	38%	18%	4%		78%
	Responsive Instructors	70%	28%	2%			98%
		Recommend Program	29%	49%	22%		
	Improve Teaching	31%	51%	16%	2%		82%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructors	Overall	38%	44%	17%	2%		81%
Program	Overall Program	25%	34%	34%	7%		59%
	Materials--presentation	27%	45%	25%			72%
	Program Site	59%	30%	4%	2%		89%

Table 12. Economic Demise of the Soviet Union
 Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

Calgary, AB (2015)		Strongly				Strongly	SA+A
		Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree		
<i>24 Participants</i>							
Program	Useful Information, Will Use	67%	33%				100%
	Binder Useful	75%	25%				100%
	Fit Well into Curriculum	54%	42%	4%			96%
	Well Organized	92%	8%				100%
		Yes	No				
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Would Attend Another	100%					100%
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Instructors	Content	92%	8%				
	Presentation	92%	8%				

Table 13. Economics Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

**EOFT-1
Fall 2015**

<i>21 Participants</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	55%	35%	5%	5%		90%
Clear Content	55%	30%	10%	5%		85%
Challenging Content	40%	55%	5%			95%
Responsive Instructor	70%	15%	5%			85%
Timely Return of Assignmer	90%	10%				100%
Recommend Course	60%	30%	10%			90%
Improve Teaching	60%	35%		5%		95%
	Excep- tional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	65%	15%	15%	5%		80%
Lectures	35%	40%	20%	5%		75%
Activities	50%	40%	5%	5%		90%
Assignments	30%	40%	20%	10%		70%
Materials	50%	30%	15%		5%	80%
Discussion Boards	25%	25%	35%	10%	5%	50%

Pre- and Post-test Results

Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
81%	86%	5%

**EOFT-1
Summer 2016**

<i>22 Participants</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	30%	55%	5%	10%		85%
Clear Content	30%	60%	10%			90%
Challenging Content	30%	55%	10%	5%		85%
Responsive Instructor	80%	20%				100%
Timely Return of Assignmer	70%	30%				100%
Recommend Course	45%	40%	5%		10%	85%
Improve Teaching	35%	50%	5%	10%		85%
	Excep- tional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	45%	55%				100%
Lectures	25%	40%	20%	10%	5%	65%
Activities	20%	65%	10%	5%		85%
Assignments	20%	55%	20%	5%		75%
Materials	25%	60%	5%		10%	85%
Discussion Boards	20%	35%	35%	5%	5%	55%

Pre- and Post-test Results

Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
83%	83%	0%

Table 13. Economics Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

**EOFT-2
Winter 2016**

<i>16 Participants</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	71%	21%			7%	93%
Clear Content	75%	19%		6%		94%
Challenging Content	80%	20%				100%
Responsive Instructor	93%	7%				100%
Timely Return of Assignmer	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	73%	20%			7%	93%
Incorporate into Teaching	56%	38%		6%		94%
	Excep- tional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	75%	19%		6%		94%
Lectures	19%	38%	38%	6%		56%
Activities	25%	50%	25%			75%
Assignments	31%	38%	25%	6%		69%
Materials	31%	44%	19%		6%	75%
Discussion Boards	27%	33%	33%		7%	60%
Pre- and Post-test Results						
	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain			
	72%	85%	14%			

Table 14. Economic History Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

Fall 2015

11 Participants

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	55%	36%	9%			91%
Clear Content	55%	36%	9%			91%
Challenging Content	70%	30%				100%
Responsive Instructor	82%	18%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	64%	27%	9%			91%
Improve Teaching	73%	18%	9%	0%	0%	91%

	Exceptional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	73%	18%	9%			91%
Lectures	36%	18%	45%			55%
Activities	9%	45%	45%			55%
Assignments	18%	45%	27%	9%		64%
Materials	27%	27%	45%			55%
Discussion Boards	64%	9%	27%			73%
Text - Common Sense Economi	36%	36%	18%	9%	0%	73%
Text - Economic Episodes in American History	27%	18%	45%	9%	0%	45%

Winter 2016

23 Participants

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	48%	30%	17%	4%		78%
Clear Content	43%	48%	9%			91%
Challenging Content	68%	18%	9%	5%		86%
Responsive Instructor	90%	10%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	83%	17%				100%
Recommend Course	57%	30%	4%	9%		87%
Improve Teaching	65%	26%	9%			91%

	Exceptional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	57%	39%		4%		96%
Lectures	35%	30%	30%	4%		65%
Activities and activity videos	27%	23%	45%		5%	50%
Assignments	9%	50%	36%	5%		59%
Materials	22%	43%	17%	17%		65%
Discussion Boards	35%	43%	13%	9%		78%
Text - Common Sense Economi	22%	39%	26%	13%	0%	61%

Table 14. Economic History Online for Teachers
Teacher Evaluations

Text - Economic Episodes in American History	30%	17%	17%	26%	9%	48%
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	-----

Table 15. Teacher Economics: The Federal Reserve System
Teacher Evaluations

Spring 2016
19 Participants

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	58%	37%	5%			95%
Clear Content	42%	42%	11%	5%		84%
Challenging Content	37%	53%	5%	5%		90%
Responsive Instructor	68%	26%	5%			94%
Timely Return of Assignments	63%	32%		5%		95%
Recommend Course	47%	42%	11%			89%
Improve Teaching	53%	32%	10%	5%		85%

	Exceptional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	47%	32%	5%	16%		79%
Lectures	32%	32%	32%			64%
Activities and activity videos	21%	47%	21%	5%		68%
Assignments	32%	47%	15%	5%		79%
Materials	32%	47%	21%			79%
Discussion Boards	21%	53%	26%			74%

Table 16. Teacher Economics: World Development
Teacher Evaluations

Fall 2015

9 Participants

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	77%	11%		11%		88%
Clear Content	67%	22%	11%			89%
Challenging Content	56%	44%				100%
Responsive Instructor	67%	33%				100%
Timely Return of Assignments	77%	22%				99%
Recommend Course	77%	11%	11%			88%
Improve Teaching	56%	33%	11%			89%

	Exceptional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	56%	33%	11%			89%
Lectures	56%	11%	22%	11%		67%
Activities and activity videos	22%	56%		11%		78%
Assignments	44%	44%		11%		88%
Materials	66%	11%	11%	11%		77%
Discussion Boards	44%	22%	22%		11%	66%

Table 17. Economics of Disasters Online
Teacher Evaluations

Spring 2016

<i>17 Participants</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA + A
Stimulated Interest	61%	39%				100%
Clear Content	50%	39%	11%			89%
Challenging Content	44%	56%				100%
Responsive Instructor	72%	17%				89%
Timely Return of Assignments	72%	28%				100%
Recommend Course	61%	39%				100%
Improve Teaching	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Exceptional	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor Overall	56%	44%				100%
Lectures	28%	44%	22%			72%
Activities	17%	56%	28%			73%
Assignments	28%	44%	22%	6%		72%
Materials	39%	39%	17%	6%		78%
Discussion Boards	17%	50%	22%	6%	6%	67%
Pre- and Post-test Results						
	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain			
	59%	81%	22%			