

**Statistical Data
2021 FTE Annual Report**

**Table 1a. Economics for Leaders (EFL)
Pre-Post Test Results**

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Increase
EFL Rice University 1 st Cohort, June 14-18	74.2%	83.6%	12.7%
EFL Rice University 2 nd Cohort, June 14-18	77.8%	85.1%	9.5%
EFL University of California, Berkeley 1 st Cohort, June 21-25	82.3%	88.8%	7.9%
EFL University of California, Los Angeles Cohort, June 21-25	73.9%	82.2%	11.3%
EFL Yale University 1 st Cohort, June 14-18	78.8%	86.4%	9.7%
EFL Yale University 2 nd Cohort, June 21-25	78.2%	81.5%	4.2%
EFL University of California, Berkeley 2 nd Cohort, June 28-July 2	79.5%	84%	5.7%
EFL University of Texas at Austin Cohort, June 28-July 2	81.5%	87.2%	7%
EFL Southern Methodist University Cohort (In-Person), July 5-11	68.8%	82.8%	20.3%
EFL Tufts University Cohort, July 5-9	75%	83.9%	11.9%
EFL Emory University, July 12-16	78.8%	85.6%	8.6%
EFL University of Chicago 1 st Cohort, July 12-16	78.6%	87.1%	10.9%
EFL University of Chicago 2 nd Cohort, July 12-16	82.3%	91%	10.6%
EFL University of Washington Cohort, July 12-16	70.6%	83.9%	18.9%
EFL Brown University 1 st Cohort, July 19-23	76%	83.6%	10%
EFL Brown University 2 nd Cohort, July 19-23	76.4%	86.1%	12.7%
EFL University of California, Santa Barbara Cohort, July 26-30	74.7%	78.5%	5.1%
EFL University of Michigan Cohort (Advanced), August 2-5	88.6%	91.2%	2.9%
EFL 1 st Week Virtual Cohort	84%	87.9%	4.6%
EFL 2 nd Week Virtual Cohort	74.1%	83.3%	12.5%
EFL 3 rd Week Virtual Cohort	74.6%	86.5%	16%
EFL 4 th Week Virtual Cohort	81.3%	86.8%	6.7%
Overall Percent	77.7%	85.3%	9.9%

**Table 1b: Economic Forces in American History (EFIAH)
Pre-Post Test Results**

EFIAH Brown	46.9%	64.6%	38%
EFIAH William & Mary	46.3%	70.3%	51.9%
Overall Percent	46.6%	67.4%	45%

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

Overall		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
	<i>750 Respondents</i>						
Economics	Stimulated Interest	48%	45%	6%	1%		93%
	Clear Content	65%	32%	2%	1%		97%
	Challenging Content	47%	47%	5%	1%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	24%	2%			98%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	39%	41%	17%	3%		80%
	Clear Content	52%	40%	7%	1%		92%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	26%	1%	1%		98%
Overall	Recommend Program	48%	41%	9%	1%	1%	89%
	Improve Understanding	56%	39%	4%	1%		95%

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

Rice University 1st Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>36 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	63%	34%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	69%	28%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	43%	51%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	31%	51%	18%			82%
	Clear Content	49%	45%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	23%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	66%	31%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	49%	43%	8%			92%

Rice University 2nd Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	59%	35%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	53%	38%	9%			91%
	Challenging Content	41%	53%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	15%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	21%	38%	35%	3%	3%	59%
	Clear Content	32%	44%	21%		3%	76%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	21%		3%		97%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	29%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding	68%	29%	3%			97%

UC, Berkeley 1st Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	41%	44%	12%	3%		85%
	Clear Content	68%	26%	3%	3%		94%
	Challenging Content	50%	35%	12%	3%		85%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	24%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	50%	38%	3%	6%	3%	88%
	Clear Content	65%	26%	6%		3%	91%
	Responsive Instructors	79%	18%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	44%	32%	12%	12%		76%
	Improve Understanding	47%	38%	12%		3%	85%

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

UC, Berkeley 2nd Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>40 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	64%	36%				100%
	Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
	Challenging Content	54%	46%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	15%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	41%	41%	15%		3%	82%
	Clear Content	60%	37%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	23%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	36%	3%	2%		95%
	Improve Understanding	67%	33%				100%

UCLA Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>36 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	36%	50%	11%	3%		86%
	Clear Content	69%	25%		6%		94%
	Challenging Content	44%	56%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	69%	31%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	45%	36%	11%	8%		81%
	Clear Content	53%	39%	8%			92%
	Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	50%	36%	11%		3%	86%
	Improve Understanding	56%	36%	5%	3%		92%

Yale University 1st Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>30 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	50%	43%	4%		3%	93%
	Clear Content	60%	33%	4%		3%	93%
	Challenging Content	47%	43%	7%		3%	90%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	14%	3%		3%	94%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	37%	37%	20%	3%	3%	74%
	Clear Content	43%	50%	4%		3%	93%
	Responsive Instructors	67%	30%			3%	97%
Overall	Recommend Program	30%	53%	14%		3%	83%
	Improve Understanding	47%	50%			3%	97%

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

Yale University 2nd Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>36 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	47%	50%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	61%	25%	11%		3%	86%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	33%	53%	11%	3%		86%
	Clear Content	53%	47%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	78%	22%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	53%	44%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	67%	33%				100%

University of Texas at Austin Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	55%	29%	13%	3%		84%
	Clear Content	71%	26%		3%		97%
	Challenging Content	48%	45%	3%		3%	93%
	Responsive Instructors	81%	16%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	32%	39%	29%			71%
	Clear Content	52%	45%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	26%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	55%	39%	3%	3%		94%
	Improve Understanding	61%	32%	7%			93%

Southern Methodist University Cohort (In-Person)		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>45 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	36%	55%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	60%	33%	7%			93%
	Challenging Content	59%	36%	5%			95%
	Responsive Instructors	72%	26%	2%			98%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	38%	38%	19%	2%	2%	76%
	Clear Content	31%	45%	14%	10%		76%
	Responsive Instructors	50%	33%	7%	10%		83%
Overall	Recommend Program	48%	43%	7%	2%		91%
	Improve Understanding	60%	38%	2%			98%

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

Tufts University Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	57%	40%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	71%	26%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	40%	60%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	80%	17%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	26%	57%	8%	6%	3%	83%
	Clear Content	46%	37%	17%			83%
	Responsive Instructors	60%	37%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	29%	56%	15%			85%
	Improve Understanding	54%	43%	3%			97%

Emory University Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	38%	50%	12%			88%
	Clear Content	56%	41%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	38%	50%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	26%		3%		97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	47%	32%	12%	9%		79%
	Clear Content	47%	50%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	82%	18%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	45%	49%	6%			94%
	Improve Understanding	50%	47%	3%			97%

University of Chicago 1st Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	68%	29%	3%			97%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	85%	15%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	47%	38%	12%	3%		85%
	Clear Content	71%	24%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	59%	35%	3%	3%		94%
	Improve Understanding	61%	33%	3%		3%	94%

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

University of Chicago 2nd Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	32%	62%	3%	3%		94%
	Clear Content	53%	44%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	26%	62%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	44%	47%	9%			91%
	Clear Content	59%	38%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	26%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	41%	41%	15%	3%		82%
	Improve Understanding	41%	50%	6%	3%		91%

University of Washington Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	63%	37%				100%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Challenging Content	42%	55%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	29%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	45%	45%	7%	3%		90%
	Clear Content	52%	39%	7%	3%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	58%	42%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	55%	35%	10%			90%
	Improve Understanding	65%	35%				100%

Brown University 1st Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>37 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	50%	44%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	64%	33%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	39%	58%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	89%	11%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	58%	22%	16%	3%		81%
	Clear Content	64%	33%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	92%	8%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	52%	42%	6%			94%
	Improve Understanding	67%	30%	3%			97%

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

Brown University 2nd Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	48%	52%				100%
	Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
	Challenging Content	55%	45%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	74%	19%	7%			94%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	16%	42%	36%	3%	3%	58%
	Clear Content	45%	39%	10%	6%		84%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	35%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	42%	39%	19%			81%
	Improve Understanding	58%	36%	3%	3%		94%

UC, Santa Barbara Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	30%	58%	6%	6%		88%
	Clear Content	56%	38%	6%			94%
	Challenging Content	41%	50%	9%			91%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	24%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	35%	47%	12%	3%	3%	82%
	Clear Content	47%	41%	9%		3%	88%
	Responsive Instructors	56%	41%			3%	97%
Overall	Recommend Program	35%	53%	6%	3%	3%	88%
	Improve Understanding	38%	59%	3%			97%

University of Michigan Cohort (Advanced Students)		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>33 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	52%	45%		3%		97%
	Clear Content	76%	24%				100%
	Challenging Content	46%	42%	9%	3%		88%
	Responsive Instructors	64%	30%	6%			94%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	49%	27%	24%			76%
	Clear Content	64%	30%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	24%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	64%	30%	6%			94%
	Improve Understanding	61%	39%				100%

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

1st Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	39%	58%	3.23%			97%
	Clear Content	55%	45%				100%
	Challenging Content	45%	45%	7%	3%		90%
	Responsive Instructors	48%	48%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	39%	42%	13%	6%		81%
	Clear Content	48%	42%	10%			90%
	Responsive Instructors	71%	29%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	4%	39%	13%	3%		84%
	Improve Understanding	54%	35%	10%			90%

2nd Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	44%	35%	12%	6%	3%	79%
	Clear Content	65%	35%				100%
	Challenging Content	53%	44%		3%		97%
	Responsive Instructors	76%	18%	6%			94%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	41%	41%	15%		3%	82%
	Clear Content	47%	50%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	32%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	47%	32%	15%		6%	79%
	Improve Understanding	53%	35%	6%	3%	3%	88%

3rd Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	35%	53%	6%	6%		88%
	Clear Content	56%	41%	3%			97%
	Challenging Content	38%	50%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	65%	32%		3%		97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	35%	41%	18%	6%		76%
	Clear Content	56%	38%	3%	3%		94%
	Responsive Instructors	68%	29%	3%			97%
Overall	Recommend Program	35%	53%	9%		3%	88%
	Improve Understanding	47%	47%		6%		94%

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

4th Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>32 Respondents</i>							
Economics	Stimulated Interest	44%	50%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	72%	28%				100%
	Challenging Content	44%	53%	3%			97%
	Responsive Instructors	63%	37%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	44%	50%	3%	3%		94%
	Clear Content	66%	28%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	44%	44%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding	63%	34%	3%			97%

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

Overall	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>742 Respondents</i>						
Professors	62%	28%	8%	1%		90%
Mentor Teachers	62%	27%	7.60%	2%		89%
Program Coordinators	60%	29%	10%	1%		89%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	49%	28%	18%	4%	1%	77%
Zoom Web	56%	30%	12%	2%		86%
Moblab Education	61%	27%	10%	2%		88%
Pear Deck	53%	28%	15%	3%		81%

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

Rice University 1st Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>35 Respondents</i>						
Professors	59%	27%	14%			86%
Mentor Teachers	76%	23%	1%			99%
Program Coordinators	59%	24%	17%			83%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	31%	40%	29%			71%
Zoom Web	60%	20%	17%	3%		80%
Moblab Education	43%	37%	11%	9%		80%
Pear Deck	52%	31%	14%	2%		83%

Rice University 2nd Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	68%	27%	4%	1%		95%
Mentor Teachers	69%	24%	6%	1%		93%
Program Coordinators	55%	27%	24%	4%		82%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	56%	28%	9%	6%		84%
Zoom Web	59%	28%	9%		3%	87%
Moblab Education	74%	13%	13%			87%
Pear Deck	68%	19%	13%			87%

UC, Berkeley 1st Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	53%	31%	13%	2%	1%	84%
Mentor Teachers	66%	24%	7%	3%		90%
Program Coordinators	59%	32%	9%			91%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	35%	44%	9%	12%		79%
Zoom Web	62%	21%	17%			83%
Moblab Education	70%	18%	12%			88%
Pear Deck	50%	32%	15%	3%		82%

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

UC, Berkeley 2nd Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>37 Respondents</i>						
Professors	78%	21%				100%
Mentor Teachers	84%	15%	2%			98%
Program Coordinators	68%	24%	7%	1%		92%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	67%	19%	11%		3%	86%
Zoom Web	67%	22%	11%			89%
Moblab Education	75%	22%		3%		97%
Pear Deck	72%	19%	6%	3%		91%

UCLA Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>36 Respondents</i>						
Professors	61%	32%	7%			93%
Mentor Teachers	65%	25%	7%	3%		90%
Program Coordinators	61%	32%	7%			93%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	46%	23%	28%	3%		69%
Zoom Web	54%	34%	6%	6%		88%
Moblab Education	69%	20%	8%	3%		89%
Pear Deck	49%	29%	20%	2%		78%

Yale University 1st Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>30 Respondents</i>						
Professors	58%	27%	12%		3%	85%
Mentor Teachers	52%	40%	3%	2%	3%	92%
Program Coordinators	55%	38%	2%	3%	2%	93%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	58%	19%	15%	8%		77%
Zoom Web	54%	34%	8%	4%		88%
Moblab Education	61%	27%	8%	4%		88%
Pear Deck	42%	35%	19%	4%		77%

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

Yale University 2nd Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>36 Respondents</i>						
Professors	64%	29%	6%	1%		93%
Mentor Teachers	56%	30%	13%	1%		86%
Program Coordinators	56%	28%	15%	1%		84%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	46%	43%	11%			89%
Zoom Web	54%	37%	9%			91%
Moblab Education	49%	37%	14%			86%
Pear Deck	48%	26%	23%	3%		74%

University of Texas at Austin Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Professors	68%	26%	1%	5%		94%
Mentor Teachers	71%	23%	3%	3%		94%
Program Coordinators	71%	26%	3%			97%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	68%	10%	13%	9%		78%
Zoom Web	74%	10%	13%	3%		84%
Moblab Education	74%	19%	3%	3%		93%
Pear Deck	74%	10%	10%	6%		84%

Southern Methodist University Cohort (In-Person)	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>40 Respondents</i>						
Professors	58%	35%	5%	2%		93%
Mentor Teachers	29%	42%	17%	8%	4%	71%
Program Coordinators	49%	29%	13%	7%	2%	78%
<i>Program Facilities</i>						
Residence Halls	13%	33%	40%	12%	2%	46%
Food Service		3%	43%	33%	21%	3%
Recreational Activities	10%	13%	38%	28%	10%	23%

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

Tufts University Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	57%	37%	4%	2%		94%
Mentor Teachers	44%	43%	12%		1%	87%
Program Coordinators	43%	37%	20%			80%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	49%	27%	21%	3%		76%
Zoom Web	55%	33%		12%		88%
Moblab Education	67%	27%	6%			94%
Pear Deck	49%	36%	15%			85%

Emory University Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	59%	32%	6%	3%		91%
Mentor Teachers	65%	25%	7%	3%		90%
Program Coordinators	65%	23%	6%	6%		88%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	52%	24%	18%	3%	3%	76%
Zoom Web	58%	33%	6%	3%		91%
Moblab Education	49%	39%	9%	3%		88%
Pear Deck	49%	27%	21%		3%	76%

University of Chicago 1st Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	73%	23%	4%			96%
Mentor Teachers	79%	15%	3%		3%	94%
Program Coordinators	73%	24%	3%			97%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	50%	24%	23%	3%		74%
Zoom Web	74%	20%	6%			94%
Moblab Education	44%	35%	21%			79%
Pear Deck	62%	26%	9%	3%		88%

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

University of Chicago 2nd Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	43%	40%	13%	3%		83%
Mentor Teachers	49%	40%	2%			89%
Program Coordinators	60%	38%	2%			98%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	47%	35%	12%	6%		82%
Zoom Web	47%	32%	18%		3%	79%
Moblab Education	50%	32%	9%	9%		82%
Pear Deck	35%	47%	18%			82%

University of Washington Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Professors	64%	26%	10%			90%
Mentor Teachers	46%	32%	8%	2%		78%
Program Coordinators	53%	39%	7%			92%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	42%	23%	32%	3%		65%
Zoom Web	39%	45%	16%			84%
Moblab Education	74%	19%	7%			93%
Pear Deck	52%	29%	19%			81%

Brown University 1st Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	71%	25%	4%			96%
Mentor Teachers	64%	22%	10%	3%		87%
Program Coordinators	78%	19%	3%			97%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	55%	15%	24%	6%		70%
Zoom Web	63%	25%	12%			88%
Moblab Education	56%	22%	16%	6%		78%
Pear Deck	53%	28%	13%	6%		81%

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

Brown University 2nd Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Professors	74%	16%	10%			90%
Mentor Teachers	66%	13%	13%	8%		79%
Program Coordinators	68%	16%	14%		2%	84%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	45%	29%	26%			74%
Zoom Web	52%	32%	16%			84%
Moblab Education	55%	32%	13%			87%
Pear Deck	52%	35%	10%	3%		87%

UC, Santa Barbara Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	67%	18%	13%	2%		85%
Mentor Teachers	68%	24%	6%	2%		92%
Program Coordinators	54%	27%	16%	2%		81%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	41%	29%	18%	9%	3%	70%
Zoom Web	38%	29%	29%	3%		68%
Moblab Education	56%	29%	12%	3%		85%
Pear Deck	56%	21%	18%	5%		77%

University of Michigan Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>33 Respondents</i>						
Professors	64%	24%	9%		3%	88%
Mentor Teachers	59%	29%	12%			88%
Program Coordinators	53%	26%	20%		1%	79%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	35%	31%	31%		3%	66%
Zoom Web	38%	43%	19%			81%
Moblab Education	72%	25%	3%			97%
Pear Deck	50%	28%	19%	3%		78%

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

1st Week Virtual Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Professors	48%	44%	7%	2%		92%
Mentor Teachers	61%	24%	15%			85%
Program Coordinators	56%	24%	14%	2%		84%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	57%	26%	17%			83%
Zoom Web	60%	30%	10%			90%
Moblab Education	53%	34%	13%			87%
Pear Deck	43%	3%	20%			80%

2nd Week Virtual Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>33 Respondents</i>						
Professors	62%	26%	11%		1%	88%
Mentor Teachers	59%	33%	8%			92%
Program Coordinators	57%	38%	5%			95%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	53%	27%	7%	3%	10%	80%
Zoom Web	53%	33%	7%	7%		87%
Moblab Education	63%	27%	10%			90%
Pear Deck	60%	30%	7%	3%		90%

3rd Week Virtual Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Professors	65%	26%	4%	3%	2%	91%
Mentor Teachers	65%	29%	6%			94%
Program Coordinators	57%	25%	12%	3%	2%	82%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	56%	38%		6%		94%
Zoom Web	56%	32%	12%			88%
Moblab Education	68%	23%	9%			91%
Pear Deck	44%	26%	21%	9%		70%

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

4th Week Virtual Cohort	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>32 Respondents</i>						
Professors	55%	27%	13%	5%		82%
Mentor Teachers	73%	21%	5%	1%		94%
Program Coordinators	59%	36%		5%		95%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	45%	26%	23%	6%		71%
Zoom Web	52%	26%	16%	3%	3%	78%
Moblab Education	65%	16%	16%	3%		81%
Pear Deck	52%	26%	16%	6%		78%

Table 4. Economic Forces in American History: Student Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program

Brown University <i>35 Respondents</i>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Economics	Stimulated Interest	40%	54%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	63%	37%				100%
	Challenging Content	40%	51%	6%	3%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	20%	3%			97%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	43%	43%	14%			86%
	Clear Content	71%	29%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	77%	20%			3%	97%
Overall	Recommend Program	37%	60%	3%			97%
	Improve Understanding	48%	46%	6%			94%

College of William & Mary <i>33 Respondents</i>		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
Economics	Stimulated Interest	48%	52%				100%
	Clear Content	70%	30%				100%
	Challenging Content	30%	61%	3%	6%		91%
	Responsive Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Leadership	Stimulated Interest	33%	43%	18%	3%	3%	76%
	Clear Content	61%	33%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
Overall	Recommend Program	58%	30%	12%			88%
	Improve Understanding	52%	48%				100%

Table 5. Economic Forces in American History: Student Evaluations of Staff Members and Applications

Brown University	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>35 Respondents</i>						
Professors	64%	19%	16%	1%		83%
Mentor Teachers	80%	12%	6%	1%	1%	92%
Program Coordinators	76%	19%	4%	1%		95%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	40%	43%	14%		3%	83%
Zoom Web	49%	31%	17%	3%		80%
Pear Deck	51%	34%	9%	3%	3%	85%

College of William and Mary	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>33 Respondents</i>						
Professors	80%	19%	1%			99%
Mentor Teachers	75%	25%				100%
Program Coordinators	63%	23%	11%	2%		86%
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	59%	16%	25%			75%
Zoom Web	53%	34%	10%		3%	87%
Pear Deck	63%	25%	12%			88%

**Table 6. Entrepreneurship and the Global Economy:
Student Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Yale University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>34 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	38%	53%	6%	3%		91%
Clear Content	62%	29%	9%			91%
Challenging Content	62%	32%	6%			94%
Responsive Instructor	82%	18%				100%
Recommend Program	38%	38%	18%	3%	3%	76%
Improve Understanding	38%	53%	6%	3%		91%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Application Platforms</i>						
Canvas Learning	53%	31%	16%			84%
Zoom Web Conferencing	63%	28%	9%			91%
Zodiak	22%	19%	25%	19%	15%	41%
Professor	64%	21%	9%	3%	3%	85%
Guest Speaker Sessions	49%	32%	9%	6%	1%	81%

**Table 7. Environment and the Economy:
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Overall	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>67 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	91%	9%				100%
Clear Content	82%	18%				100%
Challenging Content	85%	15%				100%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
Recommend Course	93%	7%				100%
Improve Teaching Professors	90%	10%				100%
	85%	14%	1%			99%
<i>Program Components</i>						
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Meeting Space	48%	21%	26%	6%	0%	69%
Food	41%	24%	17%	1%	0%	65%
Social Distancing and Safety Measures	55%	13%	17%	5%	3%	68%

**Table 7. Environment and the Economy:
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Boise, ID	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>25 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	84%	16%				100%
Clear Content	80%	20%				100%
Challenging Content	92%	8%				100%
Responsive Instructors	96%	4%				100%
Recommend Course	88%	12%				100%
Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
Instructors	82%	18%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Meeting Space	28%	24%	36%	12%		52%
Food	42%	25%	21%			67%
Social Distancing and Safety	38%	4%	25%	13%	8%	42%

Cincinnati, OH	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	N/A
<i>12 Respondents</i>							
Stimulated Interest	83%	17%				100%	
Clear Content	67%	33%				100%	
Challenging Content	75%	25%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%	
Recommend Course	92%	8%				100%	
Improve Teaching	92%	8%				100%	
Instructors	75%	21%	4%			96%	
<i>Program Components</i>	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
Meeting Space	50%	25%	25%			75%	
Food	25%	8%		8%		33%	59%
Social Distancing and Safety	58%	33%	9%			91%	

**Table 7. Environment and the Economy:
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	N/A
<i>30 Respondents</i>							
Stimulated Interest	100%					100%	
Clear Content	90%	10%				100%	
Challenging Content	83%	17%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	97%	3%				100%	
Recommend Course	97%	3%				100%	
Improve Teaching Instructors	90%	10%				100%	
	92%	7%	1%			99%	
<i>Program Components</i>	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
Meeting Space	63%	17%	17%	3%		80%	
Food	47%	30%	20%			77%	3%
Social Distancing and Safety	67%	13%	13%			80%	7%

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

Columbus, OH	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	88%	12%				100%
Clear Content	88%	12%				100%
Challenging Content	76%	24%				100%
Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
Recommend Course	88%	12%				100%
Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
Instructors	82%	12%	6%			94%
<i>Program Components</i>	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Meeting Space	41%	24%	29%	6%		65%
Food	56%	25%	13%	6%		81%
Social Distancing and Safety	65%	12%	17%	6%		77%

Jacksonville, FL	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	76%	18%	6%			94%
Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
Challenging Content	88%	12%				100%
Responsive Instructors	88%	6%			6%	94%
Recommend Course	94%	6%				100%
Improve Teaching	81%	19%				100%
Instructors	91%	9%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Meeting Space	53%	23%	18%		6%	76%
Food	59%	29%	12%			88%
Social Distancing and Safety	76%	12%	12%			88%

**Table 9a. Economics for Leaders:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

1st Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Respondents</i>							
Student/Teacher Sessions	Stimulated Interest	67%	33%				100%
	Clear Content	73%	27%				100%
Teacher-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Clear Content	80%	13%		7%		93%
	Challenging Content	67%	26%		7%		93%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Supplemental Materials	67%	26%	7%			93%
	Recommend Program	93%	7%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	100%					100%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	53%	47%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Program Components</i>							
	Lectures	73%	20%	7%			93%
	Activities	73%	14%	13%			87%
	Overall Program	80%	20%				100%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
	Professors	72%	18%	8%			90%
	Mentor Teachers	53%	32%	10%	2%		85%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
	Canvas Learning	50%	36%	14%			86%
	Zoom Web	50%	36%	7%	7%		86%
	Moblab Education	50%	14%	29%		7%	64%
	Pear Deck	50%	21%	29%			71%

**Table 9a. Economics for Leaders:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

2nd Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Respondents</i>							
Student/Teacher Sessions	Stimulated Interest	53%	40%		7%		93%
	Clear Content	53%	47%				100%
Teacher-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	60%	40%				100%
	Clear Content	67%	33%				100%
	Challenging Content	67%	33%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	100%					100%
	Supplemental Materials	80%	20%				100%
	Recommend Program	73%	27%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	73%	27%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	67%	33%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Program Components</i>							
	Lectures	60%	20%	20%			80%
	Activities	53%	40%	7%			93%
	Overall Program	60%	33%	7%			93%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
	Professors	68%	19%	10%			87%
	Mentor Teachers	50%	28%	10%			78%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
	Canvas Learning	53%	7%	40%			60%
	Zoom Web	67%	20%	13%			87%
	Moblab Education	40%	40%	20%			80%
	Pear Deck	53%	27%	20%			80%

**Table 9a. Economics for Leaders:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

3rd Week Virtual Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>16 Respondents</i>							
Student/Teacher Sessions	Stimulated Interest	50%	44%	6%			94%
	Clear Content	94%	6%				100%
Teacher-Only Sessions	Stimulated Interest	63%	37%				100%
	Clear Content	88%	12%				100%
	Challenging Content	81%	19%				100%
	Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
	Supplemental Materials	75%	25%				100%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	69%	31%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	56%	44%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Program Components</i>							
	Lectures	33%	40%	27%			73%
	Activities	67%	26%	7%			93%
	Overall Program	67%	33%				100%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
	Professors	35%	46%	14%			81%
	Mentor Teachers	36%	38%	24%	2%		74%
<i>Application Platforms</i>							
	Canvas Learning	38%	19%	44%			56%
	Zoom Web	38%	37%	25%			75%
	Moblab Education	56%	31%	13%			87%
	Pear Deck	56%	31%	13%			87%

**Table 9b. Economics for Leaders:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Austin, TX In-Person Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>16 Respondents</i>							
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	56%	44%				100%
	Clear Content	56%	44%				100%
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	56%	44%				100%
	Clear Content	60%	40%				100%
	Challenging Content	69%	19%	12%			88%
	Responsive Instructors	75%	25%				100%
	Supplemental Materials	73%	27%				100%
	Recommend Program	88%	12%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	31%	69%				100%
Improve Understanding of Teaching	73%	27%				100%	
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Program Components</i>							
	Lectures	31%	38%	25%		6%	69%
	Activities	88%	12%				100%
	Overall Program	56%	38%	6%			94%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
	Professors	38%	38%	12%	6%	6%	76%
	Mentor Teachers	87.5%	12.5%				100%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
	Hotel	50%	25%	19%	6%		75%
	Food	27%	20%	47%		6%	47%
	Location	44%	25%	31%			69%

**Table 9b. Economics for Leaders:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Boulder, CO In-Person Cohort		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>16 Respondents</i>							
Morning Sessions	Stimulated Interest	94%	6%				100%
	Clear Content	93%	7%				100%
Afternoon Sessions	Stimulated Interest	100%					100%
	Clear Content	100%					100%
	Challenging Content	81%	13%	6%			94%
	Responsive Instructors	88%	12%				100%
	Supplemental Materials	88%	12%				100%
	Recommend Program	100%					100%
	Improve Understanding of Material	33%	67%				100%
	Improve Understanding of Teaching	75%	25%				100%
		Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
<i>Program Components</i>							
	Lectures	75%	19%	6%			94%
	Activities	69%	25%	6%			94%
	Overall Program	73%	27%				100%
<i>Program Staff</i>							
	Professors	88%	12%				100%
	Mentor Teachers	75%	19%	6%			94%
<i>Program Facilities</i>							
	Residence Halls	56%	25%	6%	13%		81%
	Food	81%	6%	13%			87%
	Location	88%	6%	6%			94%

Table 10.
Teacher Economics: Understanding the Federal, Budget, Debt and Deficits (TE: BDD)
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>21 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	48%	43%	9%			91%
Clear Content	38%	57%	5%			95%
Challenging Content	33%	67%				100%
Recommend Course	52%	43%	5%			95%
Improve Teaching	57%	38%	5%			95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor	38%	48%	9%	5%		86%
Timely Return of Assignment	86%	14%				100%
Responsive Instructors	76%	14%	10%			90%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	5%	76%	10%	5%		81%
Activities	10%	67%	19%	4%		77%
Materials	19%	62%	14%	5%		81%
Assignments	5%	71%	9%	5%		76%
Discussion	14%	43%	38%	5%		57%

Table 11. Economics of Disasters Online (EoDO): Teacher Evaluations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>15 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	33%	60%	7%			93%
Clear Content	20%	73%	7%			93%
Challenging Content	27%	60%	13%			87%
Recommend Course	47%	33%	7%	13%		80%
Improve Teaching	47%	53%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor	40%	40%	20%			80%
Timely Return of Assignment	73%	27%				100%
Responsive Instructors	73%	27%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	20%	53%	20%	7%		73%
Activities	20%	33%	40%	7%		53%
Materials	20%	60%	20%			80%
Assignments	20%	47%	20%	13%		67%
Discussion	27%	27%	33%	13%		54%

**Table 12. Economics Online for Teachers: Fundamentals (EOFT Fundamentals)
Teacher Evaluations**

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

**Table 13. Economics Online for Teachers: Institutions, Government and the Economy
(EOFT Institutions)
Teacher Evaluations**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>14 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	64%	36%				100%
Clear Content	57%	29%	7%	7%		86%
Challenging Content	57%	36%		7%		93%
Recommend Course	57%	43%				100%
Improve Teaching	71%	29%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor	50%	43%	7%			93%
Timely Return of Assignment	100%					100%
Responsive Instructors	93%	7%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	29%	64%		7%		93%
Activities	50%	43%	7%			93%
Materials	43%	29%	28%			72%
Assignments	29%	43%	21%	7%		72%
Discussion	14%	72%	7%	7%		86%

Table 14.
Economic Forces in American History Online: Colonialism – Early 20th Century
(EFIAHO: Colonialism)
Teacher Evaluations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A	N/A
<i>12 Respondents</i>							
Stimulated Interest	50%	50%				100%	
Clear Content	42%	50%	8%			92%	
Challenging Content	42%	42%	8%	8%		84%	
Recommend Course	25%	59%		8%	8%	84%	
Improve Teaching	33%	50%			17%	83%	
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S	N/A
Instructor	58%	34%	8%			92%	
Timely Return of Assignment	83%	17%				100%	
Responsive Instructors	83%	17%				100%	
<i>Program Components</i>							
Lectures	17%	50%		8%		67%	25%
Activities	8%	50%	17%	25%		58%	
Materials	25%	50%	17%		8%	75%	
Assignments	17%	58%	17%		8%	75%	
Discussion	17%	58%	17%	8%		75%	

Table 15.
Economic Forces in American History Online: Early 20th Century – Present
(EFIAHO: Present)
Teacher Evaluations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>18 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	72%	28%				100%
Clear Content	56%	44%				100%
Challenging Content	39%	56%	5%			95%
Recommend Course	56%	39%	5%			95%
Improve Teaching	83%	11%	6%			94%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor	72%	28%				100%
Timely Return of Assignment	89%	11%				100%
Responsive Instructors	94%	6%				100%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	11%	56%	22%	11%		67%
Activities	33%	55%	6%	6%		88%
Materials	22%	61%	11%	6%		83%
Assignments	22%	66%	6%	6%		88%
Discussion	22%	56%	22%			78%

Table 16.
Economic Demise of the Soviet Union Online (EDSUO)
Teacher Evaluations of Sessions, Instructors, and Overall Program

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	82%	18%				100%
Clear Content	69%	25%	6%			94%
Challenging Content	82%	6%	12%			88%
Recommend Course	82%	12%	6%			94%
Improve Teaching	88%	12%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Instructor	65%	6%	29%			71%
Timely Return of Assignment	88%	12%				100%
Responsive Instructors	71%	23%				94%
<i>Program Components</i>						
Lectures	35%	41%	12%	6%	6%	76%
Activities	41%	29%	18%	12%		70%
Materials	59%	23%	12%	6%		82%
Assignments	47%	24%	23%	6%		71%
Discussion	41%	35%	18%	6%		76%

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Overall	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>372 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	74%	25%	1%			99%
Clear Content	77%	21%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	72%	26%	2%			98%
Instructor Responsiveness	88%	12%	1%			99%
Recommend Course	84%	15%	1%			99%
Improve Teaching	75%	24%	1%			99%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	69%	24%	6%	1%		93%
Virtual Presentation	63%	29%	7%	1%	1%	92%

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Understanding Global Economic Issues (Sept. 19, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>57 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	65%	31%	2%	2%		96%
Clear Content	65%	33%		2%		98%
Challenging Content	62%	36%		2%		98%
Instructor Responsiveness	84%	16%				100%
Recommend Course	68%	26%	4%	2%		94%
Improve Teaching	58%	37%	5%			95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	62%	29%	7%	2%		91%
Virtual Presentation	61%	26%	9%		4%	87%

Economics of Disasters (October 24, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>48 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
Clear Content	79%	19%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	73%	23%	4%			96%
Instructor Responsiveness	92%	6%	2%			98%
Recommend Course	88%	10%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	79%	19%	2%			98%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	75%	18%	6%	1%		93%
Virtual Presentation	62%	32%	4%	2%		94%

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Fundamentals of Environmental Economics (November 7, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>58 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	60%	38%	2%			98%
Clear Content	70%	28%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	59%	40%	1%			99%
Instructor Responsiveness	79%	21%				100%
Recommend Course	79%	19%	2%			98%
Improve Teaching	71%	29%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	66%	27%	7%			93%
Virtual Presentation	60%	31%	9%			91%

Economics of Disasters (January 30, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>35 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	76%	24%				100%
Clear Content	86%	11%	3%			97%
Challenging Content	82%	18%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	91%	9%				100%
Improve Teaching	83%	17%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	63%	29%	7%	1%		92%
Virtual Presentation	58%	35%	6%			93%

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Economic Demise of the Soviet Union (February 20, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>61 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
Clear Content	74%	26%				100%
Challenging Content	69%	31%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	93%	7%				100%
Recommend Course	90%	10%				100%
Improve Teaching	79%	21%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	66%	27%	5%	2%		93%
Virtual Presentation	47%	40%	12%	1%		87%

Issues of International Trade (March 6, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>57 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	82%	16%	2%			98%
Clear Content	84%	14%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	82%	16%	2%			98%
Instructor Responsiveness	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	86%	14%				100%
Improve Teaching	79%	19%	2%			98%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	70%	22%	8%			92%
Virtual Presentation	74%	24%	2%			98%

**Table 17a. One Day Programs:
Teacher Virtual Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Making Sense of the Federal Budget, Debt, and Deficits (May 1, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>56 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	75%	25%				100%
Clear Content	86%	12%	2%			98%
Challenging Content	79%	18%	3%			97%
Instructor Responsiveness	86%	12%	2%			98%
Recommend Course	89%	11%				100%
Improve Teaching	80%	20%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	78%	16%	5%	1%		94%
Virtual Presentation	76%	19%	5%			95%

**Table 17b. One Day Programs:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Overall	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>95 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	71%	29%				100%
Clear Content	79%	20%	1%			99%
Challenging Content	74%	25%	1%			99%
Instructor Responsiveness	81%	18%	1%			99%
Recommend Course	80%	19%	1%			99%
Improve Teaching	80%	18%	2%			98%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	74%	18%	4%	4%		92%
Meeting Space	66%	20%	14%			86%
Food	58%	27%	13%	1%	1%	85%

**Table 17b. One Day Programs:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Understanding Global Economic Issues -Lincoln, NE (October 24, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	74%	26%				100%
Clear Content	79%	21%				100%
Challenging Content	79%	21%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	84%	16%				100%
Recommend Course	79%	21%				100%
Improve Teaching	79%	21%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	79%	21%				100%
Meeting Space	84%	16%				100%
Food	47%	47%	5%			94%

Fundamentals of Environmental Economics - Las Vegas, NV (June 9, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	91%	9%				100%
Clear Content	100%					100%
Challenging Content	100%					100%
Instructor Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	91%	9%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	91%	9%				100%
Meeting Space	82%	18%				100%
Food	70%	10%	20%			80%

**Table 17b. One Day Programs:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Fundamentals of Environmental Economics - Belleville, PA (July 27, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	64%	36%				100%
Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
Challenging Content	91%	9%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	100%					100%
Recommend Course	100%					100%
Improve Teaching	82%	18%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	95%	5%				100%
Meeting Space	46%	27%	27%			73%
Food	100%					100%

Understanding Global Economic Issues - Farmington, MI (August 11, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>23 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	61%	39%				100%
Clear Content	65%	30%	5%			95%
Challenging Content	65%	30%	5%			95%
Instructor Responsiveness	61%	35%	4%			96%
Recommend Course	65%	35%				100%
Improve Teaching	78%	13%	9%			91%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	49%	25%	11%	15%		74%
Meeting Space	52%	26%	22%			78%
Food	48%	30%	22%			78%

**Table 17b. One Day Programs:
Teacher In-Person Evaluations of Content, Materials, Instructors, and Overall Program**

Fundamentals of Environmental Economics - Oceanport, NJ (August 17, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>17 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	65%	35%				100.00%
Clear Content	71%	29%				100.00%
Challenging Content	53%	47%				100.00%
Instructor Responsiveness	76%	24%				100.00%
Recommend Course	71%	23%	6%			94.00%
Improve Teaching	71%	29%				100.00%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	71%	23%	3%	3%		94.00%
Meeting Space	65%	6%	29%			71.00%
Food	53%	12%	23%	6%	6%	65.00%

Understanding Global Economic Issues - Chattanooga, TN (August 27, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>14 Respondents</i>						
Stimulated Interest	79%	21%				100%
Clear Content	86%	14%				100%
Challenging Content	71%	29%				100%
Instructor Responsiveness	86%	14%				100%
Recommend Course	86%	14%				100%
Improve Teaching	86%	14%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Economics Instructors	79%	14%	7%			93%
Meeting Space	71%	29%				100%
Food	50%	50%				100%

Table 18. Webinars: Teacher Evaluations

Overall	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>96 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	74%	25%		1%		99%
Recommend Course	57%	40%	3%			97%
Improve Teaching	50%	46%	3%	1%		96%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	41%	44%	15%			85%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length		8%	82%	10%		

Table 18. Webinars: Teacher Evaluations

The COVID Economy - What's Next?						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>31 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	90%	10%				100%
Recommend Course	61%	39%				100%
Improve Teaching	53%	47%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	48%	45%	7%			93%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length		13%	77%	10%		

26 Trillion and Counting: What Is Our Debt Capacity?						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>22 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	77%	23%				100%
Recommend Course	68%	27%	5%			95%
Improve Teaching	50%	45%	5%			95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	32%	50%	18%			82%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length		5%	95%			

Table 18. Webinars: Teacher Evaluations

Federal Budgets and Expenditures Are Not The Same						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>8 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	25%	63%		12%		88%
Recommend Course		75%	25%			75%
Improve Teaching	13%	62%	13%	12%		75%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter		25%	75%			25%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length			88%	12%		

Spending My Money or Your Money: How The Incentives Change						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>6 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	50%	50%				100%
Recommend Course	33%	67%				100%
Improve Teaching	50%	50%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	33%	67%				100%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length			83%	17%		

Table 18. Webinars: Teacher Evaluations

Bidenomics: The President’s Plan for the Economy						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>29 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	72%	28%				100%
Recommend Course	66%	34%				100%
Improve Teaching	55%	41%	4%			96%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	55%	38%	7%			93%
	Much Too Short	Short	About Right	Too Long	Much Too Long	
Webinar Length		10%	76%	14%		

Table 19. Virtual Workshops: Teacher Evaluations

Overall	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>70 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	84%	13%	2%		1%	97%
Recommend Course	78%	20%	1%			99%
Improve Teaching	80%	16%	2%	1%	1%	96%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	76%	23%	1%			99%
Topic Rating	67%	24%	9%			91%

Table 19. Virtual Workshops: Teacher Evaluations

Active Learning Simulations Can Be Virtual Too! – The Great Depression (September 15, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content Recommend Course Improve Teaching	73%	27%				100%
	82%	18%				100%
	73%	27%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	82%	18%				100%
Topic Rating	73%	18%	9%			91%

Active Learning Simulations Can Be Virtual Too! – Money and Inflation (October 6, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>20 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content Recommend Course Improve Teaching	95%		5%			95%
	80%	20%				100%
	85%	15%				100%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	75%	20%	5%			95%
Topic Rating	70%	20%	10%			90%

Table 19. Virtual Workshops: Teacher Evaluations

Active Learning Simulations Can Be Virtual Too! – Cartels & Competition or A Question of Trust (November 9, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>11 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	91%	9%				100%
Recommend Course	73%	18%	9%			91%
Improve Teaching	81%	9%	9%			90%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	82%	18%				100%
Topic Rating	73%		27%			

Active Learning Simulations Can Be Virtual Too! – In the Chips (December 1, 2020)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>9 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	78%	22%				100%
Recommend Course	44%	56%				100%
Improve Teaching	56%	33%		11%		89%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	56%	44%				100%
Topic Rating	44%	56%				100%

Table 19. Virtual Workshops: Teacher Evaluations

Active Learning in the Virtual Classroom: Twenty-Seven Trillion and Counting (April 14, 2021)						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	SA+A
<i>19 Respondents</i>						
Clear Content	79%	16%			5%	95%
Recommend Course	94%	6%				100%
Improve Teaching	90%	5%			5%	95%
	Exceptional	Superb	Good	Fair	Poor	E+S
Presenter	79%	21%				100%
Topic Rating	68%	32%				