

Evaluation of the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM) Program 2002-2016

Scott deMarchi, Duke University

Sean Gailmard, University of California

Lauren Guggenheim, University of Michigan

Arthur Lupia, University of Michigan

Elizabeth Maggie Penn, University of Chicago

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
1. Overview of the Program	5
2. The Evaluation Plan	9
3. The Survey of EITM Participants	11
4. Evaluations from Senior Scholars	27
APPENDIX A. EITM Survey Letter and Questionnaire	34
APPENDIX B. The Complete Set of Open Ended Responses	45
APPENDIX C. The Complete List of Participants in This Version of the EITM Program, 2002-2016. .	178
APPENDIX D. Evaluation Letters	191

Executive Summary

This document offers an evaluation of the EITM Summer Institutes and associated projects from a series of grants to Harvard University, Duke University, and the University of Michigan from 2002 to 2016. This evaluation provides new information and analysis that complements the information provided in yearly reports submitted since 2002.

The EITM projects have provided new educational and research opportunities for hundreds of students and faculty. In its early years, the emphasis was on classroom lectures, the students were almost exclusively male and drawn from a small set of elite institutions. In response to feedback and to spread the benefits of EITM pedagogy, the program has evolved in important ways.

The content of syllabi and activities are more dynamic and participatory. The days are structured to promote students understanding of, and ability to apply, a range of complex analytical methods. Even as EITM has moved to serve more students per year, it has done so in ways that produce more small group activities and more one-on-one mentoring opportunities.

Over the same period EITM has changed its outreach and content to make it more accessible to more students while maintaining the project's original vision of precision and rigor. EITM now draws students from a broad range of institutions. EITM has also pursued a range of strategies to broaden inclusiveness. Over the last few years, women have outnumbered men as EITM participants and EITM has made important gains in providing innovative research opportunities for members of historically underrepresented groups.

The evaluation's main emphasis is to document the effect of EITM's evolving strategies and practices on tangible outcomes, such as improved or more powerful research designs, more effective strategies for teaching complex methodological concepts, and student abilities to contribute to high-value private and public sector decision making contexts. Overall, the EITM alumni are remarkably successful on all counts. However, EITM selects participants based on their likely potential for such success, which makes EITM's causal impact difficult to observe from reviewing CVs.

For this reason, EITM designed an innovative survey that asks participants to construct counterfactual assessments of how EITM changed the trajectory and content of their research careers. From this design, we learn that over 90% of students cite EITM as having had an important effect on their career. The design also clarifies some of the means by which these effects occurred. Roughly half of the students, for example, cite EITM as the origin of a new collaboration which led to tangible research results. More talk about how EITM's strategies produce unparalleled networking and mentoring opportunities that changed the trajectory of their careers.

Our inquiry also entails a substantial qualitative component. We asked participants and outside observers to comment on how EITM has affected their careers and the field as a whole. We received hundreds of responses – all of which are included in appendices to this report. Some students from earlier years request changes to the pedagogy that are consistent with the changes that we have made. Others offer different opinions on EITM’s attempts to diversify the participant base – with some concerned that we have made the materials too accessible. A more common finding, however, is that EITM participation helped students and faculty see research in new ways and helped them to produce more effective theoretical and empirical work for the rest of their careers.

We also asked participants to comment on consequences of different possible futures for the EITM program. Most participants and outside observers see the program as vibrant and see its evolving outlook (including the inclusion of qualitative methods) as a distinct source of innovation and opportunity for political science. Thank you for your consideration.

1. Overview of the Program

The stated goal of many public sector and private sector organizations is to protect or enhance quality of life for others. Federally funded social scientific research can help organizations achieve these goals. Social science research makes factories, offices, and farms more efficient. Social science research helps critical decision makers evaluate and increase the effectiveness of a wide range of strategies, including the diplomatic and military plans that are essential to national security. Social scientific research also has more direct effects on citizens' quality of life. In domains ranging from education to health to personal finance, social science empowers people to navigate challenging environments more effectively. Throughout the life course, social scientific knowledge helps citizens better understand the world around them.

The EITM program seeks to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of publicly-oriented social science research. It does so by offering training and mentoring opportunities to young scholars. The EITM program's activities include dynamic lectures and seminars, a range of skill building opportunities, outcome-oriented group projects, and many different kinds of one-on-one interaction with senior researchers. Collectively, these activities are designed to help young scholars develop and execute research agendas that are appropriately rigorous while also having qualities that allow empirical and substantive evaluation.

EITM's training focuses on how to develop rigorous models of strategic interaction that can be synchronized with credible empirical research designs. These efforts are greatly needed. Today, there remain theories that are produced without sufficient reference to empirical knowledge that could help prospective learners evaluate the model's relevance to cases that they care about. Similarly, empirical results are regularly interpreted as having clear substantive implications despite the absence of well specified theories that can help prospective learners place the results in a more appropriate context.

EITM works to help scholars see the problems associated with these ways of claiming to understand the social world. EITM then offers participants multiple ways to make more effective use of their research opportunities. Our efforts focus on showing young scholars how to work in ways that clarify their scholarship's relevance and potential for increasing knowledge, improving decision outcomes, and protecting and enhancing quality of life.

In 2016, this version of the EITM project completed its 15th summer institute. As our recent annual reports to NSF indicate, our newest cohorts report being very pleased with the program. While the newer versions of the EITM continue some practices from the past, they also include important differences.

Over the years, the PIs of this project (whose identities have evolved with every new proposal cycle) use participant feedback to evaluate what has worked well and not so well. On a regular basis, PIs use this advice to make decisions about which practices to carry into the future, which practices to tag as part of our history, and which aspects to revise or reinvent. We have no desire to continue previous strategies just for the sake of doing so. Time is precious. The needs of the scientific community, and the critically important problems to which it can direct its quickly evolving skill and knowledge base, are urgent matters. We feel a duty to have every EITM endeavor provide maximum value to its participants and the many social and scientific communities that all of us go on to serve.

The current group of PIs, in particular, is deeply interested in a regular process of reinvention and has instituted significant changes to the program during the first years of their leadership. As a result of this outlook, recent incarnations of the EITM summer institutes are quite different than earlier versions.

In the first years of EITM, it was not unusual to have 7-10 hours of daily lecture-based activities. As a result of our experiences and student input, we have continually modified day plans and syllabi to balance lectures with small-group activities and one-on-one mentoring. In recent years, a typical day will have 3-4 hours of lecture-based activities complemented by a wide range of dynamic, small-group, and one-on-one activities. Group exercises devoted to research design and model development help students learn about different ways to work. These exercises and activities offer opportunities to rethink old ideas or pursue potentially transformative collaborations with other EITM participants. Individual students can, in the course of three weeks, meet with dozens of faculty and mentors for one-on-one advice and consultation.

More than the day plans have changed. So has our outlook on how EITM can best serve fast-evolving and increasingly diverse scholarly communities.

When the EITM program started, and was discussed in formative meetings at the National Science Foundation, the modeling emphasis was almost exclusively on game theoretic models and the empirical emphasis was almost exclusively on regression-based analyses of secondary data. On the basis of student input, and a project-based commitment to regularly integrate new and different types of scholars as faculty, students, and mentors, the content and perspective of today's EITM summer institutes today is quite different. The models on which we focus extend well beyond game theory and into agent based and other dynamic modeling approaches. Empirically, we spend more time on experimental research and methods, on questions pertaining to data access and research transparency, and on the many implications of the advances in scholarly debates about, and understanding of, causal inference. We have also very consciously expanded the EITM framework to include qualitative research as a core

component. Thanks to a growing understanding in our discipline of the inferential advantages of many qualitative research frameworks and methods, and conceptual advances associated with these activities, EITM now highlights both the synergies and complementarities of qualitative and multi-method research and the approaches with which EITM is commonly associated.

The program also looks different in photographs. In the early years, the demographic makeup of students and faculty was heavily male, heavily white, and heavily skewed towards a small set of elite institutions. This early outcome reflected a number of factors including a lack of support systems, and few or no mentoring networks, for women or members of historically underrepresented groups who wanted to pursue certain types of theoretical and empirical work. Though a number of universities and professional associations have devoted greater efforts to developing such systems and networks, it became clear in this project's formative years that we would have to create our own systems and networks if we wanted to "fast-track" our goals of a broader and more diverse participant base. To this end, we have engaged in much greater communication (which often involves much more listening than speaking), more expansive outreach, and efforts such as the mentors-in-residence program, the EITM scholarship program, and the EITM certificate program. These activities have produced significant changes in our participants' scholarly and social demographics. We describe each activity in turn.

The *mentors-in-residence program* selects young faculty who serve as role models and mentors for students while receiving mentoring and career advice from the more senior faculty who participate in EITM every year. Our mentors in recent years have included more women than men and draw from an increasingly broad set of institutions.

The *EITM scholarship program* provides valuable opportunities to students at departments not traditionally associated with advanced training in research methods. The concrete opportunity offered is to obtain training through the ICPSR summer programs. In 2011, with NSF encouragement and support, EITM created a partnership with the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) Summer Program in Quantitative Methods of Social Research. The partnership resulted in the creation of a scholarship and certification program to help encourage participation in the EITM Summer Institutes from a greater diversity of students. *The result has been a significant diversification of the institutions from which EITM draws applicants and students as well as greater participation from groups that have been historically underrepresented in STEM and high-tech fields.* Most of the scholarship winners are women or are from historically represented groups. The EITM scholarship program offers these populations a bridge to greater scholarly opportunities and also allows them to see EITM opportunities for themselves and their peers.

The *EITM Certification* program, certifies participants in the ICPSR summer programs who have achieved excellent performance (A- or better) in EITM related courses. Hundreds of students from universities around the world actively seek EITM certification to signal to their home institutions, the summer institutes, and prospective collaborators and employers their interest in the EITM approach to social science. The EITM Certification program has been very successful at drawing students from a much wider range of institutions into greater coursework in theoretical modeling and topics such as causal inference. In the first five years of the program, 546 students have earned certificates.

In sum, this EITM project is diversifying both with respect to demographics and institutions because our mission is to change the discipline. We would like the social sciences as a whole to do a better job producing knowledge that is valuable to many segments of society. Science and society benefit from projects such as ours casting a broad net. As a result of the efforts described above, and parallel changes in other institutions, we have seen strong increases in the participation of women and historically underrepresented minorities in this version of the EITM project. Our students come from more universities and backgrounds than ever before. Moreover, in each of the last two years, at least half of our applicants and at least half of those accepted for admission in the summer institute have been women.

Over the years, we have also sought ways to provide insights of value to people who did not or could not participate in EITM events. We have developed and evolved a series of websites that capture combinations of pedagogy and content from previous years. These materials can be seen at our central website: www.eitminstitute.org. We also now use the website to solicit and process applications for the scholarship program and summer institutes – which have helped reduce out administrative costs. We have also reached out to sister EITM activities to help increase their value. We are working with the Washington University EITM effort to carry forward its legacy. We have integrated their alumni base into our own and are including them in the networking and academic activities that we offer to this project's participants. Last year, we also began a joint marketing effort with EITM Europe and we are working on a number of more productive ways to create synergies from our respective efforts.

Given the importance of social science to society, it is imperative that research be conducted in ways that are reliable, replicable, and actionable. The EITM Summer Institutes, and its associated programs, are designed to give students the training that they need to continually challenge and reinvigorate science's and society's understanding of phenomena that are critical to quality of life. For fifteen years, we have given students a unique opportunity to reconstruct their ideas about how to produce effective research. They have emerged from our program with a stronger context for interpreting theory, empirical work and their intersections. EITM content is now being offered as a matter of course in hundreds of graduate and undergraduate programs. EITM students go on to teach social science in innovative ways and offer improved

technical expertise to private and public sector organizations throughout the world. We are grateful for the support of the National Science Foundation for its support of this project.

2. The Evaluation Plan

In 2015, the National Science Foundation responded to our most recent request for funding by supporting summer institutes and associated programs in 2016 and 2017. It also awarded us an additional \$35,000 for the purpose of conducting an evaluation of the program. The remainder of this report constitutes our response to this request. The information provided in this evaluation is over and above information provided about single-year activities in the annual reports that we and the PIs who preceded us in this version of the EITM project have filed since 2002.

Our objective is to offer evidence about the extent and magnitude of the value that EITM has offered to its participants and to political science. We have attempted to offer an evaluation that does not assume its answer and that takes very seriously inferential problems associated with attempting to document causal relationships between participation in EITM activities and subsequent scientific and related professional contributions. The perspective of the PIs is that we want to continue organizing and conducting EITM activities only if it is consistent with the National Science Foundation's stated mission and in the best interest of science and society to do so.

We begin by reviewing some of the inferential challenges that we face.

First, there are multiple possible evaluative dimensions. Many of our participants go on to become researchers, teachers, and public servants of various varieties. Others go into the private sector. In those roles, they do many different things – some of which are commonly associated with scholarship and some of which are not. Some develop successful research careers. Others provide service in ways that are not commonly seen on an academic CV (such as improvements in teaching pedagogy or analytic contributions to a range of private and public sector activities).

Second, because there are many dimensions, we must make decisions about how to weight them in claims about EITM-related outcomes. Even if we do not express a preference for, say, research over teaching, our inquiry and report will present these and other potentially measurable sources of EITM effectiveness metrics in some order. That order may affect how some readers view this evaluation.

With these challenges in mind, the authors of this evaluation engaged in a discussion of how to proceed. In particular, we focused on the following question: With respect to each potentially important dimension of an EITM evaluation (e.g., research, teaching, private sector accomplishments, public sector advances), what are the measurable outcomes on which we want to focus?

We chose to try to collect information on both processes and outcomes. In other words, we decided to collect data not just on what effect EITM may have had on intellectual products such as research articles, syllabi, or analytic advice produced for the private or public sector, but also on what effect EITM may have had on the strategies and practices that participants used when attempting to develop these products.

We next turned to questions of causality. This is a big challenge for us. EITM participants were not randomly assigned to their roles. Some scholars applied to participate, while others did not. We accepted some applications, and not others. Most people to whom we offered admission attended, but some did not. As a result, there are substantial selection effects at work. In particular, we choose applicants for admission based on our sense of their potential to make effective use of the opportunities that we offer. We base this judgment on evidence of what they have already accomplished. As a result, we cannot infer just by looking at participants' updated CVs whether or how the EITM program had a beneficial effect on their subsequent contributions.

To be clear, EITM participants have a long and impressive record of accomplishment. As a whole, they have published several thousand academic articles, with hundreds appearing in top journals in a number of fields. They have published hundreds of books with leading university presses. They have won dozens of awards for this research. They have been PIs or co-PIs on hundreds of grant proposals and externally funded research. While the group as a whole is still relatively young – our first students are now 12 to 14 years from having completed a PhD – they now hold important leadership positions in academic departments, universities, and public and private sector organizations around the world. As a whole, their accomplishments are remarkable. But a desire for honesty compels us to tell you that we and our predecessors selected these individuals to participate in EITM programs because we saw their potential for this type of success. Our goal is to obtain credible evidence of what role EITM played in these outcomes.

On this point, we sought the guidance of our program officer. To our concerns about wanting to produce a credible statement about the impact and effectiveness of the EITM program, our program officer advised:

“All I can say is do the best you can. I realize that it would be difficult to satisfy someone who is a hard core causal inference person. You shouldn’t write for that person. Rather, focus on creating a credible evaluation of the program. This may mean that you only document what the people who have attended the institutes have done. I would be okay with that as long as it has the proper caveats attached.”

With our objectives and this advice in hand, we developed an evaluation plan that has two complementary elements. The first element is a survey of all participants in the 15 summer institutes (students, mentors, and faculty) as well as all EITM scholarship winners. The second element is a smaller request for information from senior scholars in the discipline who could be expected to have varying levels of knowledge about EITM’s impact (or lack thereof), who had never participated in one of our project’s EITM events as a lead lecturer (or who had not participated in such a role in a very long time) and would likely express an opinion of value to NSF decision makers. We now describe each of these activities in turn.

3. The Survey of EITM Participants

The authors of this document developed a survey questionnaire to be administered to all reachable participants in previous EITM institutes by this project. The University of Michigan PI and project staff member worked with two graduate students in an attempt to find a viable email address for every former participant using both an alumni database and a wide range of publicly available records. For participants that we could not find through these methods, we sought contact information from EITM cohort members, dissertation advisors, co-authors, or members of departments with which these students were once associated. As a result of these efforts, we began the evaluation with what we believed to be current email addresses for almost all participants in EITM programs. Of course, some of these addresses were no longer active when we actually administered this part of the evaluation. This is a source of non-response. That said, we are unable to identify the extent to which non-response is due to scholars receiving our invitation to participate and declining it, or our having false beliefs about the validity of our email information.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to try to document in a way that is thorough, while fitting into our designated evaluation budget, *whether and how participation in an EITM activity affected subsequent scholarship and produced concrete real outcomes of societal or scientific value*. To manage the causal identification problem described above, we pursued a tactic of asking respondents to construct the relevant counterfactual for us.

In other words, instead of asking alumni to list their post-EITM accomplishments (which are substantial), we instead asked them to describe to us their beliefs about how their post-EITM activities would have been different had they not participated. Our rationale for pursuing this strategy is the belief that the participants will have the most accurate and comprehensive perspective on their abilities and opportunities before and after EITM. Given this strategy, the questionnaire mixes discrete choice and open-ended questions. As a result, our analysis and interpretation of this data will be part quantitative and part qualitative.

The questionnaire, included as Appendix A, begins by asking a series of questions that allows us to identify the participant's roles in the EITM project. Participants were asked whether they participated in EITM activities as students, mentors, scholarship winners, or faculty – with the understanding that a number played different roles in different years. We then asked a series of questions about the types of professional and scholarly activities in which they engaged after EITM. Respondents who indicated that they pursued an academic career were asked about teaching, research, college or university administration, and outward-facing public service. Participants who indicated that they went into the non-academic private or public sectors were asked about classes of activity common to those endeavors.

Using the answers to these initial questions, each respondent received a version of the questionnaire that was appropriate to their role and that could capture effects of EITM on their subsequent activities. The questionnaire included in Appendix A also includes the programming instructions (aka, "skip patterns") that determined which version of a questionnaire participants received. Since some respondents played multiple roles – with some having been students in an early year and then mentors or faculty in a later year -- the programming instructions assured that each respondent received a version of the questionnaire that covered possible effects of each of their roles.

It is important to note that we did not ask demographic questions beyond gender. While we were interested in additional demographic questions, the early history of this project is such that there were few women and almost no students from historically underrepresented groups. We wanted participants to be able to speak freely while minimizing risk of unwanted identifiability. To manage these conflicting concerns, we consulted the NSF guide on evaluations. The following passage was particularly meaningful to us.

"The needs of the participants must be considered. Being part of an evaluation can be very threatening to participants, and they should be told clearly and honestly why the data are being collected and how the results will be used. On most survey-type studies, assurances are provided that no personal repercussions will result from information presented to the evaluator and, if at all possible, individuals and their responses will not be publicly associated in any

report. This guarantee of anonymity frequently makes the difference between a cooperative and a recalcitrant respondent.”

Because we wanted maximum participation and honesty in the survey and because we asked many open ended questions to allow more detailed assessments of EITM’s effect on scholarship and service, we chose not to ask other demographic questions (such as race or ethnicity) because of the very high likelihood that the presence of these questions would make members of these groups in the project’s early years easy to identify. Another strategy that we used was to remind respondents, before every open-ended question, to phrase answers in non-identifiable ways if they wished to protect their confidentiality.

Because we asked the questions in this way, we present the data from the survey in two different ways. First, in the remainder of this section, we provide quantitative summaries of responses to each question. This presentation gives an overview of how participants feel about their participation in the EITM program and how they believe it affected their subsequent service to science and society. Second, as Appendix B, we offer every unedited response to each of our open-ended questions -- with redactions in cases where the text could be used to identify a specific individual. In Appendix B, you can see the full range of views as reported by our participants. This data collection and presentational strategy allows you to see, in the respondents own words, their sense of how EITM affected their subsequent theories, empirical work, teaching, and service to the public.

After designing an initial version of the questionnaire, we conducted a search for firms that could help us administer the survey. We sought firms that were sufficiently knowledgeable about survey research to administer this questionnaire reflective of all available best practices. We also needed a firm that had the ability to achieve high participation rates while maintaining confidentiality and having an ability to work within our budget. This means that they would need to understand the content of our contact list and be able to offer persuasive and professional invitations (and reminders) to participate.

Given our budget, we identified a number of firms that had the potential to do the job. We contacted the firms between May 23, 2016 and June 8, 2016. Some declined to submit a bid within our budgetary framework and others sent bids with different qualities. We reviewed the proposals that we received and determined that Soundrocket could meet our requirements and would be the most cost-effective way to collect the data we wanted. We sought additional references and asked the firm a series of follow-up questions pertaining to their ability to implement specific and critical aspects of their design. After several rounds of questions and answers, we agreed on a final set of terms and processed the contract through the University of Michigan. Thereafter, we worked with Soundrocket to refine the questionnaire so that its visual

appearance and content would be sufficiently interesting to respondents to minimize break-offs (incomplete surveys) and confusion about the meaning of a question.

The survey was conducted between August 22, 2016 and October 3, 2016. Participants were contacted via email. For participants who did not respond to the initial inquiry (a fact known by Soundrocket but not by anyone on our side), reminders were sent on a bi-weekly basis for the duration of the survey period. 297 participants responded, for a response rate of 69 percent. Of the responses, 283 completed the questionnaires, while 14 respondents answered only some of the questions for a completion rate of 95%.

We asked respondents to report their current professional status and to list the types of professional activities in which they have been involved since their participation in EITM. Table 0 reports distributions of respondents current professional statuses and post-EITM professional activities.

Table 0. Position currently held and activities engaged in

Position currently held	Frequency (answering yes)	Percent Yes (out of n=295)
Tenure track or tenured faculty position at a college or university.	195	66.1%
Non-tenure track faculty position at a college or university (e.g., postdoctoral fellow, research scientist)	34	11.5%
Research Position: Working for an Organization in the Private/Commercial Sector	9	3.1%
Research Position: Working for an Organization in the Non-Profit Sector (not including Government positions)	7	2.4%
Research Position: Working in a Government Position	9	3.1%
Graduate Student	36	12.2%
Self-employed	5	1.7%
Other	13	4.4%
Activities engaged in	Frequency (answering yes)	Percent Yes (out of n=297)
Teaching	275	92.6%
Research	294	99.0%
Principal Investigator of a grant from an external funding agency	119	40.1%
Editor or Editorial Board Member for an academic journal or university press	90	30.3%
College or university administrator	29	9.8%
Service or leadership positions within a college, university, or academic professional association not named above	122	41.1%

In the next two subsections, we report findings from the survey's substantive questions. We begin in subsection A with a broad view. We offer a quantitative assessment of responses to the questionnaires discrete choice questions. In subsection B, we examine these questions

again documenting similarities and differences in the experiences of women and men in the summer institute.

A. Participant Responses to the Survey Questions

The first question solicited participant roles in the EITM program. Table 1 shows responses to these questions. We summarize the distribution here. Since respondents can have participated in more than one way, the numbers reported for each participation category below add up to more than the number of respondents.

- 240 of the respondents were students in a summer institute.
- 20 students won EITM scholarships.
- 25 respondents served as EITM faculty.
- 38 respondents served as guest lecturers.
- 27 respondents served as mentors-in-residence.

Table 1. In what ways have you participated in EITM?

	Frequency	Percent
As a student or scholarship winner	232	78.9%
As a faculty member, a guest lecturer, or an MFR (mentor-in-residence)?	43	14.6%
As both	19	6.5%
<i>Total n</i>	<i>294</i>	

In what ways have you been a student or scholarship winner?

Student in an EITM summer institute	231	92.0%
An EITM scholarship winner	11	4.4%
Both	9	3.6%
<i>Total n</i>	<i>251</i>	

In what ways have you been a faculty member, a guest lecture, or an MFR?

Faculty member	9	14.8%
Guest lecturer	11	18.0%
MFR	22	36.1%
Faculty & guest lecturer	11	18.0%
Faculty & MFR	2	3.3%
Guest lecturer & MFR	3	4.9%
All three	3	4.9%
<i>Total n</i>	<i>61</i>	

In what follows, we categorize respondents by their most recent mode of participation in an EITM Institute. So, if a respondent participated as a scholarship winner and then as a student, we code them as a student to avoid double counting. We have a small number of participants ($N < 5$) who participated as students, and as mentors, and as faculty (always in that order). To avoid triple-counting those individuals, they are counted as faculty. None of our substantive questions name a specific role at EITM. Instead they ask respondents to characterize their experiences and their perceptions of how their EITM experiences affected their subsequent work and accomplishment. So this way of categorizing responses does not contradict subsequent question wording and provides a basis for simplifying the presentation and counting each respondent an equal number of times in the evaluation.

The first substantive question asked all respondents to offer a summary evaluation of their experience with our EITM program. We asked the question first to capture the summary impression that respondents were likely to report absent prompting of specific memories about their experiences with EITM. Table 2 reports the results.

73% of students reported having a “very positive” experience. 97% reported having a “very positive” or “somewhat positive” experience. These results show little variance across participation categories, with mentors having slightly more positive views than students or faculty, but with at least 90% of each category reporting either a “very positive” or “somewhat positive” experience. It may be worth noting that the group with the lowest overall positive ratings were the scholarship winners (labeled as scholars). This group’s scholarly interactions are with the ICPSR Summer Program and not the EITM Summer Institutes.

Table 2. Overall, how do you feel about your participation in EITM events and programs?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Very positive	72.9%	72.7%	81.8%	69.2%
Somewhat positive	24.9%	18.2%	18.2%	25.6%
Neither positive nor negative	2.3%	9.1%	0.0%	2.6%
Somewhat negative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
Very negative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total n	221	11	22	39

In an open-ended follow-up question, we asked participants “Now, we want you to think about the difference between your career as it stands now and what it would have been like if you had not participated in an EITM program. Briefly describe how your EITM experience affected your subsequent educational or professional opportunities, if it affected these opportunities at all.” An analysis of these responses reveals some of the more concrete concepts that respondents associate with these assessments. An analysis of word patterns in

the open-ended responses reveals some of the bases for these evaluations. 91 students used the word “research” in their open ended response and 72 students used the word “network.” 52 students used the word “help”, 46 students used the word “work”, 40 students used the word “opportunity” and 35 students used the word “professional.”

We then asked respondents to begin to construct the counterfactual of whether or how EITM participation affected their subsequent activities and contributions to society and scholarship. Table 3 reports a first set of results.

Over 99% of students reported that their EITM participation was useful to their subsequent professional activities, with 63% reporting that EITM was “very useful” in their subsequent career. Mentors had very similar reports.

Over 90% of the scholarship winners, whose main interaction is with ICPSR, report that their participation was “very useful” or “somewhat useful.” It should be noted that the scholarship program is very new and that nearly all of the scholarship winners are still in graduate school. So there has been limited opportunity for any career effects to take hold.

Faculty reported less effect, which is to be expected. Many of our faculty are senior and/or well established by the time that they come to EITM. In fact, these attributes are why we selected them to work with the students. As a result, we are surprised that so many (over 80%) report that their participation has been useful to their subsequent careers, despite the fact that most were already well-established before working with us.

Table 3. How useful has your participation in EITM events and programs been to your subsequent professional activities—research, jobs, consulting, etc.?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Very useful	62.9%	72.7%	63.6%	35.9%
Somewhat useful	29.4%	18.2%	31.8%	28.2%
Slightly useful	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%
Not useful	.9%	9.1%	4.5%	17.9%
Total n	221	11	22	39

We next inquired about whether participating in EITM led to “new collaborations.” This is an attempt to drill down on the counterfactual of how a scholar’s career would have been different had they not participated in EITM. Valid counterfactual assessments of this type of phenomena requires accurate memories of when certain events did and did not happen. Fortunately, the memory associated with questions like “of did you meet someone or begin a professional relationship as a result of EITM participation” is one that is easier than many others to recall. A person can look at their CV, see a list of projects, papers, or publications and

can remember when they *were not* working on the document in question. They can also remember when they were doing these things and can narrow the time frame to when the work on the project began. Hence, this is the type of question that can get us more direct access to whether and how EITM affected an individual’s scholarship. While it is possible that the scholars would have been doing something else in the weeks that they spent at EITM that would have led to new collaborations (hence reducing the causal effect of those specific weeks at EITM on their scholarship), our assumption is that many participants would have remained at existing universities or been in other circumstances that made analogous “new” collaborations impossible or unlikely. Hence, there are multiple reasons to believe that the following information reflects valid recollections of EITM participation serving as the origin of discrete scholarly products.

Over half of our respondents reported engaging in a new collaboration as a consequence of their EITM participation. Table 4 shows responses to this question.

Table 4. Did you engage in new collaborations as a result of your experience in an EITM program (e.g., you met a new collaborator, learned things that produced a new collaboration with someone not at EITM)?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	53.2%	81.8%	61.9%	43.6%
No	46.8%	18.2%	38.1%	56.4%
Total n	216	11	21	39

53% of the students reported new collaborations as did 62% of the mentors and 44% of the faculty. Given the fact that these participants spent only a few weeks together, these collaboration levels are extraordinary. Differences across groups also provide interesting information.

That the mentors were more likely to find new collaborators is, we think reflective of their career stage. Most of the mentors were assistant professors just a few years from PhD. By this time, the mentors had established their own research foundation and would be in an ideal position to expand their intellectual networks.

For graduate students, many of whom are still trying to complete a dissertation, that type of activity has higher risks. That said, we are surprised that so many report new collaborations as a result of EITM. That surprise extends to the faculty response to this question. Given that they had established research agendas prior to working with us, we did not expect that so many would have embarked on new collaborations as a consequence of their EITM experiences.

The scholarship winners report extremely high levels of collaboration. Following the caveat above, we can accept some credit for that outcome as a result of enabling their participation in

the ICPSR summer program, but substantial credit for these collaborations must accrue to ICPSR.

We next asked respondents who experienced a new EITM-fueled collaboration to describe how the new collaboration affected their careers. Table 5 shows responses.

Table 5. How did these collaborations affect your career?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Large positive effect	52.2%	55.6%	53.8%	47.1%
Small positive effect	44.3%	44.4%	46.2%	47.1%
No effect	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Total n	115	9	13	17

In every category, over 94% of our “new collaborators” reported that the new collaboration had a “positive” effect on their career. Moreover, roughly half of the respondents in every category described the effect as “large.”

Summarizing the findings in Tables 4 and 5, 51% of all summer institute students in the survey reported that EITM produced a collaboration that had a positive effect on their career. Moreover, 27% of all summer institute students in the survey reported that EITM not only produced a new collaboration but that the new collaboration had a “large effect” on their career.

These numbers are somewhat higher for mentors, who arrive at EITM in a better position to form new collaborations, and somewhat lower for faculty, who arrive at EITM with a well-established portfolio of research and collaborations already in hand. Scholarship winners report a slightly higher impact in this regard, with credit for this final outcome shared with ICPSR.

An analysis of word patterns in the open-ended responses reveals some of the bases for these evaluations. 33 students used the word “research” in their open ended response, 30 students used the word “dissertation” 24 students used a word with the stem “improv[e]” and 21 students used the word “work.”

We then asked respondents to discuss the effect of new collaborations on the quality of the work – as opposed to the effect on their careers. Table 6 shows responses to this question.

Table 6. Did these collaborations lead to any new or improved articles, books, grants, reports, public service, consulting opportunities or business opportunities?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	78.3%	88.9%	100.0%	82.4%
No	21.7%	11.1%	0.0%	17.6%
Total n	115	9	13	17

In each category, at least 78% of respondents reported that the new collaboration produced by participating in an EITM activity led to “new or improved articles, books, grants, public service, consulting opportunities, or business opportunities.” From a substantive perspective, the work that these summer institute participants, mentors, and faculty have done after their EITM has been widely published and has growing influence as indicated by citation counts or ascendance to academic, public sector, or private sector leadership positions. *What Tables 4-6 show is that from the perspective of these individuals, EITM has played an important role in those advances, with many reporting that participation in EITM was a sufficient condition for the collaboration and many reporting that EITM as a whole played a large role in their subsequent research productivity.*

We then asked about whether their EITM experience improved their teaching. An important caveat in interpreting responses is that most of these respondents were graduate students when they participated in EITM. This fact can bias responses in ways that inflate EITM’s apparent influence. For example, if a respondent had little or no teaching experience before participating in EITM, then they may overcredit EITM for their subsequent teaching outcomes because, and unlike the collaboration counterfactual described above, they have no valid pre-EITM reference point. A countervailing source of possible negative bias is that some of these same individuals, because they are very young or still graduate students, will have done little or no teaching when they completed this survey. With these caveats in hand, Table 7 presents responses to the question.

Table 7. You stated that you have been involved in teaching since your earliest EITM experience. Did your EITM experience affect or improve your teaching in any way(s)?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	61.0%	77.8%	80.0%	66.7%
No	39.0%	22.2%	20.0%	33.3%
Total n	200	9	20	39

61% of students, 80% of mentors, 78% of scholarship winners, and two-thirds of faculty report that their EITM experience affected or improved their teaching. We are pleased to learn that so many participants see EITM as having had this effect.

As before, we are surprised at the number of faculty responding affirmatively to the question given that an EITM experience would constitute a small part of a typical faculty member’s teaching portfolio. That said, the EITM mission is distinctive enough that it may cause faculty to think about pedagogy in syllabi in ways that standard teaching assignments do not. Given EITM’s short duration, compared to the typical academic year quarter or semester, and the unusual and dynamic skill sets of EITM students, teaching in an EITM summer institute does require a different approach to the materials. All of the current PIs have served in faculty role and our experiences provide some support for the conjecture that EITM’s distinctive format may explain why so many faculty found EITM participation helpful in their subsequent teaching.

An analysis of word patterns in the open-ended responses reveals some of the bases for these evaluations. 26 students used the word “method” in their open ended response and 24 students used the word “student.” 23 students used the word “theory” and 19 students used the word “research.”

We next asked participants to evaluate whether their participation in EITM benefitted other people. We included in the survey prompt “students, colleagues, citizens, government officials, people in need, etc.” Table 8 presents responses to the question.

Table 8. Has your participation in an EITM program benefitted other people, such as students, colleagues, citizens, government officials, people in need, etc.?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	54.0%	81.8%	71.4%	73.7%
No	46.0%	18.2%	28.6%	26.3%
Total n	215	11	21	38

Majorities of all participant groups reported that their EITM participation benefitted other people. Affirmative responses were significantly more frequent among faculty and mentors than they were for summer institute participants. Given that people in faculty positions have a wider range of options for providing service to others (they are more likely to teach, to be sought as private or public sector consultants, etc.), this difference is not surprising. That the scholarship winners also report very high levels of providing benefits to others is surprising to us. Unfortunately, we did not ask an open ended follow-up on this question to learn more about the scholarship winners’ perceptions of this topic.

The survey’s final questions turned to the future of the program. We first asked whether or not respondents thought that the EITM program should continue. Table 9 reports the results.

Table 9a. There is a continuing discussion of whether or not to continue the EITM program. In your view, should the EITM be continued?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	96.2%	90.9%	95.2%	81.8%
No	3.8%	9.1%	4.8%	18.9%
Total n	213	11	21	37

96% of summer institute participants, 91% of mentors, and 82% of faculty responded that the program should be continued. 91% of the scholarship winners, whose main interaction was with ICPSR, also responded in favor of continuation.

We then asked respondents whether discontinuing the EITM program would have adverse effects. Table 9b reports the results.

Table 9b. If the EITM program were to be discontinued, would there be adverse effects?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Yes	79.2%	81.8%	100.0%	78.4%
No	20.8%	18.2%	0.0%	21.6%
Total n	207	11	21	37

80% of summer institute participants, 100% of mentors, and 79% of faculty responded that discontinuation would have adverse effects. 82% of the scholarship winners, whose main interaction was with ICPSR, also responded that discontinuation would have adverse effects.

Our final question asked whether participants would recommend EITM participation to others. Table 10 reports the results.

Table 10. How likely are you to recommend participation in an EITM program to others?

	Students	Scholars	Mentors	Faculty
Very likely	84.0%	80.0%	90.5%	59.5%
Moderately likely	12.7%	10.0%	9.5%	18.9%
Slightly likely	2.3%	10.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Not likely at all	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Total n	213	10	21	37

84% of summer institute participants, 90% of mentors, 80% of scholarship winners, and 59% of faculty responded that they were “very likely” to recommend EITM to others. Over 99% of all summer institute participants, mentors, and scholarship winners (242/244) and 89% (33/37) of faculty reported some degree of likelihood of recommending EITM to others.

The survey also included two open-ended questions asking participants to describe the “best things” about their EITM experience and the “worst things” about their EITM experiences. We characterize each set of responses in turn, the full set of responses (redacted to remove personally identifying information) is attached as Appendix B.

Words most used by students when describing the best things about EITM included research (51), network (51), meet (37), scholar/faculty (56), student (31), and new (26). Many fewer responses were offered in response to our inquiry about the “worst” things. The most used words used in this case were time (37 – referring to wanting more time to work on own projects or too much time spent on topics outside of their area of interest) and “nothing” (20 – responses saying that there was nothing wrong).

In general, participants in EITM programs describe a counterfactual where the three to four weeks that they spent in an EITM summer institute had a substantial and lasting impact on their career. For roughly half of the participants the benefit took the concrete form of a new collaboration. Even faculty and mentors, who come to EITM with existing research portfolios, express many of the same benefits. The open-ended responses tell a similar story, with many participants crediting EITM with subsequent transformations in their research agendas and increased value and impact of their publications. The open-ended responses also describe areas of improvement, particularly with respect to our use of time. Many of these responses are from students who participated in EITM before our recent changes to the structure of the summer institute and to the day plan. Yet there are still important lessons to learn from individual comments.

One unanticipated point of controversy in some of the open-ended remarks come from our efforts to broaden the participant base. Some students are pleased with this evolution, while others see it as a potential cheapening of the EITM brand. We are devoted to an evolution of the EITM program that helps participants help themselves and others draw stronger and more reliable inferences from theoretical and empirical research. We believe that broadening the applicant and participant pools in reasonable forward-looking ways does not have to be done at the expense of rigor or impact. We continue to work on revising and implementing new strategies to provide more inferential benefits to more people.

B. Differences between Female and Male Summer Institute Participants

In the early years of EITM, the project included relatively few women as participants or faculty. Over the years, more aggressive outreach, recruitment, the mentors program, the scholarship program, and the certificate program have brought the project to a new level of participation. Over the last two years, over half of our applicants to, and participants in, the EITM summer institutes have been women. At the same time, over half of our mentors and over half of our scholarship winners have been women.

Because we have a larger number of women summer institute participants from which to sample, we have confidence in our ability to analyze differences in the experiences that women and men have in the summer institute without the risk of identifying individual participants. This section conducts such an analysis. Because our numbers of mentors, scholarship winners, and faculty are smaller, we do not include a parallel analysis for those groups. Moreover, because there are some years where very few women participated, we are not using year of participation as a variable in what follows to protect confidentiality.

The aggregate data reveals some important differences between women and men summer institute participants. Table 11 provides an overview. Below we discuss topics where the response difference between men and women on at least one question is more than five percentage points.

Table 11. Overall, how do you feel about your participation in EITM events and programs?

	Female students	Male students
Very positive	66.2%	76.9%
Somewhat positive	28.6%	22.4%
Neither positive nor negative	5.2%	0.7%
Somewhat negative	0.0%	0.0%
Very negative	0.0%	0.0%
Total n	77	143

In response to our first substantive question, which solicited a summary evaluation of EITM participation, 77% of male summer institute participants described their EITM experience as “very positive.” 66% of women summer institute participants offered the same description. 99% of men described their EITM experience as “very positive” or “somewhat positive.” 95% of women offered the same description.

As a general matter, these views of EITM are positive. For this question, we asked an open-ended version as well. We used those responses to gather some evidence on why female and male students had different likelihoods of seeing EITM as “very positive” rather than “somewhat positive.” We found no significant differences. Our null finding is the result of a 5-topic lda model dividing male / female into different samples. The result is as follows:

Male

(0, 0.022*research + 0.017*students + 0.015*program + 0.008*people + 0.007*teaching + 0.006*scholars + 0.006*networking + 0.006*empirical')

(1, 0.011*research + 0.011*scholars + 0.010*students + 0.007*social)

(2, 0.019*students + 0.015*research + 0.014*faculty + 0.008*graduate + 0.007*scholars + 0.007*networking')

(3, 0.028*students + 0.022*research + 0.011*faculty + 0.009*political + 0.008*science + 0.007*graduate)

(4, 0.022*research + 0.016*students + 0.009*methods + 0.008*graduate + 0.007*models + 0.007*scholars')

Female

(0, 0.028*research + 0.018*students + 0.010*graduate + 0.010*people + 0.009*opportunity + 0.009*professional + 0.009*dissertation)

(1, 0.023*research + 0.020*students + 0.010*scholars + 0.010*methods + 0.009*feedback)

(2, 0.015*students + 0.015*research + 0.014*scholars + 0.009*network + 0.008*project + 0.007*dissertation)

(3, 0.018*research + 0.009*experience + 0.007*students + 0.007*scholars + 0.007*network + 0.007*opportunity + 0.007*skills + 0.007*feedback')

(4, 0.033*students + 0.024*research + 0.014*faculty + 0.012*methods + 0.009*graduate)

The main differences are that women are slightly more likely to emphasize “feedback” and “disserations.” Otherwise, the response patterns are quite similar.¹

In response to our question about whether EITM participation has been useful to their subsequent professional activities, 65% of male summer institute participants described their EITM experience as “very positive.” 58% of women summer institute participants offered the same description. 99% of men and 100% of women described their EITM experience as “very

¹ Code:

```
#!/usr/bin/env python
# for use with LDA topics -- use R scripts for STM

from gensim import corpora, models, similarities
import gensim
import sys
import copy
# import nltk

n_topics = 3
```

useful.” Again, almost all students (219/221) responded that the EITM had some degree of usefulness, with men being a bit more exuberant about this response than women.

The next substantive question asked whether EITM participation produced a new collaboration. 43% of female respondents and 59% of male students report a new collaboration. We then asked students how the new collaborations affected their careers. Here, 96% of men and 97% of women reported a positive effect on their career. Unlike the earlier responses, however, women were more likely than men to choose the most positive response category. 59% of women reported that their new EITM fueled collaboration had a “large positive” effect on their career, compared to 49% of men. So, from the perspective of our female participants who experienced a new collaboration as a result of EITM, the effect was very positive. We also asked whether the collaborations led to new or improved articles, books, grants, reports, public service, consulting opportunities or business opportunities. On this question the sex differential was less than one percentage point.

Outside of anecdotal evidence we can only speculate about these collaboration effects. Work published on the American Political Science Association website shows a negative correlation for women in economics between co-authoring papers and getting tenure. Using the same methodology, the same effect is not seen for men (<http://web.apsanet.org/cswp/graphs-that-will-make-you-gasp/>). A conclusion drawn by that study’s authors are that women tend to get less credit for co-authored work than men. We are very interested in learning more about this gap and closing it for women who want to pursue co-authored work. We have worked hard to recruit women mentors and faculty to ease such dynamics and we are grateful that so many of female participants feel that EITM collaborations had a very positive effect on their career.

The largest difference between women and men summer institute participants pertained to whether new collaborations affected or improved subsequent teaching. 68% of men report an effect while only 49% of women do. For this question, we asked an open-ended version as well. We can use those responses to gather some evidence on why female and male students had different likelihoods of viewing an EITM as having a positive effect on their teaching.

The survey’s next questions focused on the future of EITM. 95% of male summer institute students and 97% of female summer institute students responded that the EITM program should be continued. They differed a little bit more on the topic of adverse effects. 74% of female students believed that there would be adverse effects compared to 82% of male students.

The survey’s final discrete choice question asked whether students would recommend the program to others. Continuing an early pattern, all female students and 98% of male students report some likelihood of recommending EITM to others, but males are more likely to choose

the most positive available response option – 79% of females and 86% of males say that they are “very likely” to recommend EITM.

In general, male and female summer institute students report having had a positive experience at EITM which had a significant impact on their careers. In places where we have identified gaps, particularly in the context of collaboration, we are excited for opportunities to further develop the changes that we have instituted in the last few years – changes that reallocate time from 30-person classroom environments to smaller group and one-on-one mentoring opportunities that may be more accessible and comfortable places for a larger variety of students to gain the benefits of the evolving EITM pedagogy.

4. Evaluations from Senior Scholars

The second element of our evaluation plan was an open-response survey from senior scholars in the discipline who could potentially be expected to be knowledgeable about the EITM program. The authors of this document identified a list of 22 senior scholars across 14 different institutions. We chose individuals to represent three major subfields of political science (American politics, comparative politics, and international relations), and a variety of methodological approaches (formal theory, quantitative methodology, and qualitative methods). We attempted to identify individuals who had either never taken a lead role in any EITM institute or who had not done so in a very long time. While the EITM institutes routinely solicit feedback from graduate participants about aspects of the program that they found more or less beneficial, we have not solicited similar feedback from scholars who are actively advising and mentoring graduate students. Our goal with this survey was to reach out to a particularly knowledgeable and active set of scholars in order to gauge opinion about the strengths and shortcomings of EITM from their perspective.

After identifying our list of senior scholars, we emailed each a personalized letter. The letter begins with a brief description of the EITM program and a statement that we are in the process of reviewing the past contribution of the EITM Summer Institutes in anticipation of an upcoming grant cycle. We then asked for the recipient’s “general opinion about the EITM Summer Institute.” We listed several topics that could potentially be addressed in the response, including whether EITM provides “skills added,” highlights approaches that may not be covered at students’ home institutions, fosters diversity, and helps professionalize graduate students. One main topic of interest for us was whether these individuals routinely encourage their students to apply to the EITM program, and what they believe the main strengths and shortcomings of the program to be. A facsimile of our letter is included in Appendix D.

APPENDIX A. EITM Survey Letter and Questionnaire

This is the message sent to participants.

Dear [FIRSTNAME],

Last year, the National Science Foundation asked its long-term projects to conduct an evaluation of their activities. As a participant in previous EITM activities, NSF and the current EITM Principal Investigators are interested to learn about your views of the program and how it has affected you. For that reason, we would like to ask you to fill out a brief survey about your experience at EITM.

This survey is a focal component of the evaluation. We are seeking the views of all previous EITM participants – all students, all faculty, all MFRs (mentors), and all EITM scholarship winners. The length of the survey will depend on your prior involvement in EITM events, the survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

[Please participate now by clicking on this link.](#)

This survey is being conducted by SoundRocket, LLC, an Ann Arbor, Michigan based survey research company. SoundRocket is an independent organization, with a specialty in conducting web-based surveys.

Your participation and data are strictly confidential: Only de-identified data will be provided to NSF and to EITM researchers. Please feel free to express all of your opinions and views; your open, honest responses will help us understand where EITM is performing well and where we could work to improve.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact us via email at eitm@ssgresearch.com, or by phone at 734-527-2199.

We appreciate your participation in the EITM program and thank you for participating in this brief survey.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Crawford
Data Collection Study Director
SoundRocket, LLC
eitm@ssgresearch.com

Questionnaire Programming Specifications

Version: (D1) by R. Young on 26 July 2016

Project Number	S16009
Project Name	UMich EITM Program Evaluation
Illume Survey Name	S16009_EITM
Survey Short URL	https://ssgresearch.com/EITM

Mandatoriness (*select one*)

X	All questions are OPTIONAL (unless otherwise specified)
	All questions are OPTIONAL with SOFT PROMPT if left unanswered
	All questions are MANDATORY

Soft Prompt Text (edit if necessary)

We noticed that you did not answer a question on the previous page. It is important to us that we get a complete set of responses from you. To return to the last question please click "Previous" and select an answer; otherwise click "Next" and you will advance to the next page.

General Design / Section Setup / Branding

Survey Title (<i>header</i>)	University of Michigan EITM Program Evaluation Survey
Survey Title (<i>browser</i>)	UM EITM Evaluation

Support Email	eitm@ssgresearch.com			
Support Phone <i>(optional)</i>				
Text Emphasis Style	X	bold blue		ALL CAPS
Mobile Optimization	X	On		Off

Header Sections (leave blank if no headers are desired)

Section Label	Questions in Section
EITM Participation	PART_WAYS - PART_USE
About You	ABOUT_GENDER – ABOUT_TEACH_EXP
Overall EITM Program	OVERALL_BENEFIT – OVERALL_OTHER

Welcome Page (modify as needed)

Thank you for participating in the EITM Evaluation!

Remember, your participation and data are strictly confidential: Only de-identified data will be provided to NSF and EITM researchers. Please express all of your opinions and views; your open, honest responses will help us understand where EITM is performing well and where we could work to improve.

Click “Next” to start the survey.

End Page - Standard *(modify as needed)*

Thank you for your participation – we appreciate your time and input!

You may now close your browser.

Other Programming Notes

{PRG: SHOW FOLLOWING NOTE IN A SEPARTE BOX WITH ALL QUESTIONS THAT REQUIRE A TEXT RESPONSE}
NOTE: *Please note that any personally identifying information that you provide in your answer to this question will be included in the data. If you do not wish to be identifiable, please do not include personally-identifying information in your response.*

{SECTION HEADER: EITM PARTICIPATION}

PART_WAYS. In what ways have you participated in EITM? *(Select all that apply.)*

- 1 As a student or scholarship winner.
 - 2 As a faculty member, a guest lecturer, or an MFR (mentor-in-residence).
-

{PRG: SHOW IF PART_WAYS.1=1}

PART_WAYS_STU. In what ways have you been a student or a scholarship winner? *(Select all that apply.)*

- 1 I have been a student in an EITM Summer Institute
 - 2 I have won an EITM Scholarship that I used to attend classes at ICPSR.
-

{PRG: SHOW IF PART_WAYS.2=1}

PART_WAYS_STAFF. In what ways have you been a faculty member, a guest lecturer or an MFR? *(Select all that apply.)*

- 1 I have been a faculty member who spent more than one day leading EITM Summer Institute activities.
 - 2 I have been a guest lecturer who gave a presentation on a single day during an EITM Summer Institute or a presentation as part of a one or two-day EITM conference.
 - 3 I have been an MFR for one or more weeks during an EITM Summer Institute
-

PART_FEEL. Overall, how do you feel about your participation in EITM events and programs?

- 1 Very positive
 - 2 Somewhat positive
 - 3 Neither positive or negative
 - 4 Somewhat negative
 - 5 Very negative
-

PART_USE. How useful has your participation in EITM events and programs been to your subsequent professional activities – research, jobs, consulting, etc.?

- 1 Very useful
- 2 Somewhat useful

- 3 Slightly useful
 - 4 Not useful
-

{SECTION HEADER: ABOUT YOU}

ABOUT_GENDER. What is your gender?

- 1 Female
 - 2 Male
 - 3 Other (*Please specify*): [TEXT RESPONSE]
-

{PRG: SHOW IF PART_WAYS=1}

ABOUT_PHD. Have you been awarded a Ph.D?

- 1 Yes
 - 0 No
-

{PRG: SHOW IF ABOUT_PHD=1}

{DESIGN: DROP-DOWN}

ABOUT_PHD_WHEN. In what year did you receive your Ph.D?

[NUMERIC TEXT RESPONSE 1950-2016] {PRG: VALIDATE CODES 1950 – 2016}

ABOUT_POS. What type of position do you currently hold? *(Select all that apply.)*

- 1 Tenure track or tenured faculty position at a college or university.
 - 2 Non-tenure track faculty position at a college or university (e.g., postdoctoral fellow, research scientist)
 - 3 Research Position: Working for an Organization in the Private/Commercial Sector
 - 4 Research Position: Working for an Organization in the Non-Profit Sector (not including Government positions)
 - 5 Research Position: Working in a Government Position
 - 6 Graduate student
 - 7 Self-employed (e.g., consultant)
 - 8 Other *(Please Specify)* [TEXT RESPONSE]
-

ABOUT_ACT. Which of the following activities have you engaged in since your earliest participation in an EITM program? *(Select all that apply.)*

- 1 Teaching
 - 2 Research
 - 3 Principal Investigator of a grant from an external funding agency
 - 4 Editor or Editorial Board Member for an academic journal or a university press
 - 5 College or university administrator (e.g., department chair, dean)
 - 6 Service or leadership positions within a college, university, or academic professional association not named above.
 - 7 None of the above {PRG: EXCLUSIVE RESPONSE}
-

ABOUT_ACT2. Which of the following activities have you engaged in since your earliest participation in an EITM program? *(Select one for each.)*

		Yes	No
ABOUT_ACT2_a	Started my own business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ABOUT_ACT2_b	Worked or consulted for a government or government agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ABOUT_ACT2_c	Worked or consulted for a non-governmental, non-profit organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ABOUT_ACT2_d	Worked or consulted for a for-profit business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ABOUT_ACT2_e	Service or leadership positions in the government or private sector not named above and not in a college or university	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ABOUT_ACT2_f	Volunteer service or leadership positions not named above and not in a college or university	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

ABOUT_DIFFS_EXP. Now, we want you to think about the difference between your career as it stands now and what it would have been like if you had not participated in an EITM program. Briefly describe how your EITM experience affected your subsequent educational or professional opportunities, if it affected these opportunities at all.

[MEMO RESPONSE]

ABOUT_COLLAB. Did you engage in new collaborations as a result of your experience in an EITM program (e.g., you met a new collaborator, learned things that produced a new collaboration with someone not at EITM)?

- 1 Yes
 - 0 No
-

{PRG: SHOW IF ABOUT_COLLAB=1, ELSE GOTO ABOUT_PUB}

ABOUT_COLLAB_AFFECT. How did these collaborations affect your career?

- 1 They had a large, positive effect
 - 2 They had a small, positive effect
 - 3 They had no effect
 - 4 They had a small, negative effect
 - 5 They had a large, negative effect
-

ABOUT_COLLAB_PUB. Did these collaborations lead to any new or improved articles, books, grants, reports, public service, consulting opportunities or business opportunities?

- 1 Yes
 - 0 No
-

ABOUT_PUB. {PRG: IF ABOUT_COLLAB=1, SHOW "Beyond the collaborations just mentioned, did" ELSE "Did"} your participation in an EITM program lead to any new or improved articles, books, grants, reports, public service, consulting opportunities or business opportunities?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

{PRG: SHOW IF ABOUT_PUB=1}
{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

ABOUT_PUB_EXP. How did your EITM experiences lead to new or improved articles, books, grants, reports, public service, consulting opportunities or business opportunities?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

{PRG: SHOW IF ABOUT_ACT.1 = 1}

ABOUT_TEACH. You stated that you have been involved in teaching since your earliest EITM experience. Did your EITM experience affect or improve your teaching in any way(s)?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

{PRG: SHOW IF ABOUT_TEACH=1}
{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

ABOUT_TEACH_EXP. How did your EITM experiences affect or improve your teaching?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

{SECTION HEADER: OVERALL EITM PROGRAM}

OVERALL_BENEFIT. Has your participation in an EITM program benefitted other people, such as students, colleagues, citizens, government officials, people in need, etc.?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

{PRG: SHOW IF OVERALL_BENEFIT=1}
{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_BENEFIT_EXP. Please describe an example of how your EITM participation has benefitted a specific person or type of person?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_BEST_EXP. What would you say were the best things about your EITM experience?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_LEAST_EXP. What parts of your EITM experience did you like the least?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

OVERALL_CONTINUE. There is a continuing discussion of whether or not to continue the EITM program. In your view, should the EITM be continued?

- 1 Yes
 - 0 No
-

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_CONTINUE_EXP. Please tell us why you believe the program {PRG: IF OVERALL_CONTINUE=1 SHOW "should", IF OVERALL_CONTINUE=2 SHOW "should not", ELSE SHOW "should or should not"} be continued.

[MEMO RESPONSE]

OVERALL_DISCONT. If the EITM program were to be discontinued, would there be adverse effects?

- 1 Yes
 - 0 No
-

{PRG: SHOW IF OVERALL_DISCONT=1}

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_DISCONT_EXP. Please list one or more adverse effects of discontinuing the EITM program.

[MEMO RESPONSE]

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_CHANGE. If you could make one change to the EITM program, what would it be?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

OVERALL_REC. How likely are you to recommend participation in an EITM program to others?

- 1 Very Likely
 - 2 Moderately Likely
 - 3 Slightly Likely
 - 4 Not Likely at all
-

{PRG: SHOW TEXT RESPONSE NOTE}

OVERALL_OTHER. Is there anything else that you would like to share about the EITM project or your experience with EITM?

[MEMO RESPONSE]

APPENDIX C. The Complete List of Participants in This Version of the EITM Program, 2002-2016.

EITM Students and Attendees

Name	School while Attending EITM	EITM Year
Eric Chang	UCLA	2002
Wongi Choe	U of Washington	2002
Emily Clough	Minnesota	2002
Brian Fogarty	UNC-Chapel Hill	2002
John Griffin	Notre Dame	2002
Gang Guo	Rochester	2002
Indridi Indridason	Rochester	2002
Tatyana Karaman	UW-Milwaukee	2002
Ben Klemens	CalTech	2002
Jana Kunicova	Yale	2002
Hyeok Yong Kwon	Cornell	2002
Peter Lorentzen	Stanford	2002
Eric Magar	ITAM	2002
Andres Mejia-Acosta	Notre Dame	2002
Elizabeth Penn	CalTech	2002
Kristopher Ramsay	Rochester	2002
Jesse Richman	Carnegie Mellon	2002
Oleg Smirnov	Oregon	2002
Arthur Spirling	Oxford	2002
Mark Strahan	Washington	2002
Milan Svolik	Chicago	2002
Robert Trager	Columbia	2002
Navin Bapat	Rice	2003
Sarah Croco	Michigan	2003
Songying Fang	Rochester	2003
Stephen Gent	Rochester	2003
Matt Golder	NYU	2003
Sona Golder	NYU	2003
Wonjae Hwang	Michigan State	2003
Stuart Jordan	Princeton	2003
Gregory Koger	UCLA	2003
Matt Levendusky	Stanford	2003
Karen Long Jusko	Michigan	2003
Jason Reifler	Duke	2003
Scott Robinson	UT-Dallas	2003

Christina Schneider	Konstanz	2003
Megan Shannon	Iowa	2003
Stephen Shellman	FSU	2003
Jennifer Tobin	Yale	2003
Michael Tofias	Duke	2003
Cheng-Lung Wang	FSU	2003
Robert Weiner	UC-Berkeley	2003
Vineeta Yadav	Yale	2003
Despina Alexiadou	European University Institute	2004
Byoung-Inn Bai	U of Washington	2004
Muhammet Bas	Rochester	2004
Leo Blanken	UC Davis	2004
Damon Centola	Cornell	2004
Daniel Corstange	Michigan	2004
Michael Crespín	Michigan State	2004
Patrick Egan	UC-Berkeley	2004
Lynne Gibson-Gleiber	Maryland	2004
Matt Grossman	UC-Berkeley	2004
Nikitas Konstantinidis	Princeton	2004
Jinjie Liu	Nebraska	2004
Peter Loewen	U of Montreal	2004
Carmela Lutmar	American	2004
Monique Lyle	Duke	2004
Linda Merola	Georgetown	2004
Kevin Morrison	Duke	2004
Kirk Randazzo	Kentucky	2004
David Siroky	Duke	2004
Mariana Sousa	Notre Dame	2004
Vera Troeger	Max Planck Institute	2004
Joe Ura	UNC-Chapel Hill	2004
Stefanie Walter	Swiss Fed Inst of Tech	2004
Camber Warren	Duke	2004
Tanya Bagashka	Rochester	2005
Cristina Bodea	Rochester	2005
Eduardo Castro	Princeton	2005
Terrence Chapman	Emory	2005
Thad Dunning	UC-Berkeley	2005
Tetsuya Fujiwara	Michigan State	2005
Stephen Jessee	Stanford	2005
Hyeran Jo	Michigan	2005
Jeff Lazarus	Georgia State	2005
Jamus Lim	UC Santa Cruz	2005
Drew Linzer	UCLA	2005

Scott Moser	Carnegie Mellon	2005
Simeon Nichter	UC-Berkeley	2005
Philipp Rehm	Duke	2005
Nasos Roussias	Yale	2005
Thomas Sattler	ETH Zurich	2005
Alberto Simpser	Stanford	2005
Yuriko Takahashi	Cornell	2005
Alex Weisiger	Columbia	2005
Taehee Whang	Rochester	2005
Amy Yuen	Emory	2005
Christian Breunig	Washington	2006
Jon Caverley	Chicago	2006
Matt Holian	Ohio State	2006
Thomas Jensen	U of Copenhagen	2006
Kyle Joyce	Penn State	2006
Katja Kleinberg	UNC-Chapel Hill	2006
Valentin Krustev	Rice	2006
Ian McDonald	Duke	2006
James Monogan	UNC-Chapel Hill	2006
Monika Nalepa	Rice	2006
Yoshikuni Ono	Michigan	2006
Valeria Palanza	Princeton	2006
Robin Phinney	Michigan	2006
Christian Ponce de Leon	Chicago	2006
Philip Potter	UCLA	2006
Robi Ragan	Georgia	2006
Mary Robinson	UNC-Chapel Hill	2006
Greg Robinson	Michigan State	2006
David Schwab	Indiana	2006
Eser Sekercioglu	Stony Brook	2006
Gisela Sin	Michigan	2006
Jaekwon Suh	UCLA	2006
D.G. Webster	USC	2006
Matt Winters	Columbia	2006
Scott Wolford	Emory	2006
Dominick Wright	Michigan	2006
John Ahlquist	U of Washington	2007
Bethany Blackstone	Emory	2007
Jacqueline Demeritt	FSU	2007
Jos Elkink	Trinity College Dublin	2007
Phil Fuerst	Emory	2007
Roy Germano	UT-Austin	2007
Jean-Francois Godbout	Northwestern	2007

Maria Elena Guadamuz	UCLA	2007
Chris Haid	Chicago	2007
Haifeng Huang	Duke	2007
David Hugh-Jones	Essex	2007
Aya Kachi	UIUC	2007
Koji Kagotani	UCLA	2007
Anna Kalbhenn	ETH-Zurich	2007
Yong Kyun Kim	UNC-Chapel Hill	2007
Sonya Lebsack	UC-Berkeley	2007
Brian Min	UCLA	2007
Dana Puia	Pittsburgh	2007
Julia Rabinovich	Northwestern	2007
Yoji Sekiya	Rochester	2007
Zeynep Somer-Topcu	UC-Davis	2007
Martin Steinwand	Rochester	2007
Hiroki Takeuchi	UCLA	2007
Tatiana Vashchilko	Penn State	2007
Melissa Willard-Foster	UCLA	2007
Philip Arena	Penn State	2008
Nazli Avdan	Duke	2008
Tobias Boehmelt	Essex	2008
Martin Brunner	Konstanz	2008
Adriana Buliga-Stoian	Binghamton	2008
Cristina Corduneanu-Huci	Duke	2008
Jonghoon Eun	UT-Austin	2008
Marek Hanusch	Oxford	2008
David Hendry	UIUC	2008
Jonathan Kropko	UNC-Chapel Hill	2008
In-Won Lee	FSU	2008
Daniel Magleby	Michigan	2008
Hande Mutlu-Eren	NYU	2008
Dan Myers	Princeton	2008
SunHee Park	FSU	2008
Willem Schudel	Essex	2008
Joel Selway	Michigan	2008
Kaitlyn Sill	Louisiana State	2008
Gabriele Spilker	ETH Zurich	2008
Andrew Waugh	UCSD	2008
Faisal Ahmed	Chicago	2009
Meina Cai	Wisconsin	2009
Edwin Camp	Yale	2009
Daina Chiba	Rice	2009
Pamela Clouser McCann	Michigan	2009

Allison Dale-Riddle	Michigan	2009
Bruce Desmarais	UNC-Chapel Hill	2009
Charles Doriean	Michigan	2009
Abe Gong	Michigan	2009
Aparna Kher	Binghamton	2009
Su-Hyun Lee	Michigan	2009
Nimah Mazaheri	U of Washington	2009
Robert McGrath	U of Iowa	2009
Nils Metternich	Essex	2009
Susanne Michalik	Mannheim	2009
Pablo Montagnes	Northwestern	2009
Jon Rogowski	Chicago	2009
Josh Ryan	U of Colorado	2009
Lena Schaffer	ETH Zurich	2009
Alexander Theodoridis	UC-Berkeley	2009
Felicity Vabulas	Chicago	2009
Steffen Weiss	Essex	2009
Laron Williams	Texas A&M	2009
Byungwon Woo	Ohio State	2009
Julian Wucherpfennig	ETH Zurich	2009
Francesc Amat	Nuffield College Oxford	2010
Hanja Blendin	Konstanz	2010
Jeff Carter	Penn State	2010
Stephen Chaudoin	Princeton	2010
Kuyoun Chung	UCLA	2010
McKinzie Craig	Texas A&M	2010
Benjamin Farrer	Binghamton	2010
Jordan Gans-Morse	UC-Berkeley	2010
John Henderson	UC-Berkeley	2010
Olivier Henripin	Northwestern	2010
Alexander Herzog	NYU	2010
Aila Matanock	Stanford	2010
Amy Nelson	UC-Berkeley	2010
Natascha Neudorfer	Essex	2010
Dave Ohls	Wisconsin	2010
Evangeline Reynolds	UIUC	2010
Alexander Ruder	Princeton	2010
Laura Seelkopf	Essex	2010
Matthew Shaffer	South Carolina	2010
Florence So	UCLA	2010
Andrew Therriault	NYU	2010
Eitan Tzelgov	Penn State	2010
Rachel Wellhausen	MIT	2010

Hye Young You	Harvard	2010
Matt Zefferman	UC Davis	2010
Michael Becher	Princeton	2011
Andrew Boutton	Penn State	2011
Robert Braun	Cornell	2011
Joan Cho	Harvard	2011
Ian Cook	Pitt	2011
Erica De Bruin	Yale	2011
Dominik Duell	NYU	2011
Anna Getmansky	NYU	2011
Mauro Gilli	Northwestern	2011
Navid Hassanpour	Yale	2011
Lin Hu	ASU	2011
In Song Kim	Princeton	2011
Patrick Kuhn	Rochester	2011
Joyce Lawrence Hodel	MIT	2011
Andrew Little	NYU	2011
Irene Menendez	Nuffield College Oxford	2011
Justin Peck	UVA	2011
Amy Pond	Michigan	2011
Carlo Prato	Northwestern	2011
Didac Queralt	NYU	2011
Ludovic Rheault	U Montreal	2011
Jaime Sainz Sanramaria	UCSB	2011
Rachel Schutte	Michigan State	2011
Tolga Sinmazdemir	NYU	2011
Zenhua Wu	ASU	2011
Alero Akporiaye	UT-Dallas	2012
Cristina Alvarez Mingote	Illinois	2012
Mike Barber	Princeton	2012
Joslyn Barnhart	UCLA	2012
Katrina Browne	Cornell	2012
Jia Chen	CU Boulder	2012
Jidong Chen	Princeton	2012
Marika Csapo	UCLA	2012
Vincent Greco	Rutgers	2012
Jee seon Jeon	WUSTL	2012
Trevor Johnston	Michigan	2012
Woo Chang Kang	NYU	2012
Marko Klasjna	NYU	2012
Liam McGrath	Essex	2012
Anne Meng	UC-Berkeley	2012
Javier Osorio Zago	ND	2012

Lauren Peritz	UCLA	2012
Molly Reynolds	Michigan	2012
Janna Rezaee	UC-Berkeley	2012
Katsunori Seki	Texas A&M	2012
Eoghan Stafford	UCLA	2012
Danielle Thomsen	Cornell	2012
Andrei Zhirnov	Binghamton	2012
Shinhye Choi	UC-Berkeley	2013
Pablo Fernandez-Vazquez	NYU	2013
Joe Florence	Cornell	2013
Diego Fossati	Cornell	2013
Cesar Garcia Perez de Leon	Sciences Po	2013
Stephen Goggin	UC-Berkeley	2013
Allison Harris	Chicago	2013
Alisha Holland	Harvard	2013
Ryan Hubert	UC-Berkeley	2013
Travis Johnston	UC-Berkeley	2013
Johannes Kleibl	Essex	2013
Katherine Michel	UC-Berkeley	2013
Felipe Nunes	UCLA	2013
Ju Yeon Park	NYU	2013
Rachel Potter	Michigan	2013
Rebecca Reid	South Carolina	2013
Emily Schilling	Iowa	2013
Keith Schnakenberg	WUSTL	2013
Anna Schultz	Duke	2013
Andrey Tomashevskiy	UC Davis	2013
Ian Turner	WUSTL	2013
Yamil Velez	Stony Brook	2013
Stephane Wolton	Chicago	2013
Miranda Yaver	Columbia	2013
Kiyoung Chang	Maryland	2014
Darin Christensen	Stanford	2014
Andrew Clarke	Virginia	2014
Jason Davis	Michigan	2014
Nikhar Gaikwad	Yale	2014
Max Gallop	Duke	2014
Amuitz Garmendia Madariaga	Binghamton	2014
Jeremy Gelman	Michigan	2014
Cole Harvey	UNC-Chapel Hill	2014
Nicholas Howard	UNC-Chapel Hill	2014
Connor Huff	Harvard	2014
Jay Krehbiel	WUSTL	2014

Ron Lehrer	Essex	2014
Steven Liao	Virginia	2014
Ali Masood	South Carolina	2014
Daniel McCormack	Texas	2014
Marcos Menchaca	UCLA	2014
Elizabeth Menninga	UNC-Chapel Hill	2014
Jan Nalaskowski	Old Dominion	2014
Jeeyoung Park	Stony Brook	2014
Henry Pascoe	UT-Austin	2014
Constantin Ruhe	U of Konstanz	2014
Ali Sanaei	Michigan	2014
Jacqueline Sievert	SUNY Buffalo	2014
Fanglu Sun	Rice	2014
Huan-Kai Tseng	George Washington U	2014
Oliver Westerwinter	U of St. Gallen	2014
Paul Zachary	UC-San Diego	2014
Andrew Ballard	Duke	2015
Janina Beiser	Univ. College London	2015
Charles Crabtree	Penn State	2015
Betul Demirkaya	WUSTL	2015
Ruoxi Du	Iowa	2015
Alejandro Flores	Chicago	2015
LaGina Gause	Michigan	2015
Frank Gonzalez	Nebraska	2015
Xiaoli Guo	Florida State	2015
Yoo-Sun Jung	Purdue	2015
Christina Kinane	Michigan	2015
Monica Lineberger	South Carolina	2015
Kenneth Lowande	Virginia	2015
Marco Martini	ETH Zurich	2015
Austin Mitchell	SUNY Buffalo	2015
Kai Ou	NYU	2015
Bernhard Reinsberg	U of Zurich	2015
Abigail Rury	Iowa	2015
Jerome Schafer	Yale	2015
Andrea Vilan	UCLA	2015
Kathryn Wainfan	UCLA	2015
Dalston Ward	Washington University	2015
Cathy Wu	Texas	2015
Amanda Alvarez	Temple U	2016
Sarah Bouchat	UW-Madison	2016
Asli Cansunar	Duke	2016
Chao-yo Cheng	UCLA	2016

Menevis Cilizoglu	UNC-Chapel Hill	2016
Rebecca Cordell	Essex	2016
Eric Dunford	Maryland	2016
Chelsea Estancona	UNC-Chapel Hill	2016
David Foster	UC-Berkeley	2016
Jim Glenn	Maryland	2016
Thomas Gray	Virginia	2016
Felicia Grey	Old Dominion	2016
Calla Hummel	UT-Austin	2016
Alisha Kim	UT-Dallas	2016
Nadiya Kostyuk	Michigan	2016
Elena Labzina	WUSTL	2016
Joshua Lerner	Duke	2016
David Lindsey	UC-San Diego	2016
Howard Liu	Duke	2016
Jose Manuel Magallanes	George Mason	2016
Aseem Mahajan	Harvard	2016
Andrew McCall	UC-Berkeley	2016
Eoghan McGreevy-Stafford	UCLA	2016
Yuree Noh	UCLA	2016
Soomin Oh	Duke	2016
Anup Phayal	U of Kentucky	2016
Kara Ross Camarena	Harvard	2016
Lukas Rudolph	U of Munich (LMU)	2016
Barea Sinno	Rutgers	2016
Jeremy Spater	Duke	2016

EITM Certification Scholarship Recipients

Name	Graduate Institution	Scholarship Year
Katrina Browne	Cornell	2011
Gina Miller	Alabama	2011
E. Nicole Thornton	JHU	2011
Camillia Redding	Columbia	2011
Diego Fossati	Cornell	2011
Silvana Cimpoca	Oxford	2012
Myra (Brielle) Harbin	Vanderbilt	2012
Samantha Lange	Iowa	2012
Ben Neudorfer	VU Amsterdam	2012
Rebecca Reid	South Carolina	2012
Chelsie Bright	U Kansas	2013
Aaron Erlich	U Washington	2013

Ali Masood	South Carolina	2013
Anna Pechenina	UNT	2013
Shelli Powell Israelsen	Indiana	2013
Jacqueline Sievert	Buffalo	2013
Thomas Guarrieri	UM-Columbia	2014
Frank Gonzalez	UNL	2014
Wangqing (Sandy) Shan	Northwestern	2014
Enrijeta Shino	UF	2014
Jesseca Short	UNT	2014
Calla Hummel	UT-Austin	2015
Barea Sinno	Rutgers	2015
Jamil Scott	MSU	2015
Laila Wahedi	Georgetown	2015
Christopher Schwarz	UW-Milwaukee	2015
Amanda Alvarez	Temple	2015
Ted Rossier	Oklahoma	2016
Yanjun Liu	UC-Santa Barbara	2016
Holly Peterson	Oregon State	2016
Brianna White	Northwestern	2016
Doug Atkinson	Georgia	2016
Jose David Sierra Castillo	U Texas	2016
Ghazal Nadi	American	2016
Stephanie Kang	USC	2016
Handi Li	Duke	2016

EITM Teaching Faculty

Name	Institution	Role
Avi Acharya	Stanford	MFR
Christopher Achen	Princeton	Instructor
John Ahlquist	UW-Madison	MFR
Caitlin Ainsley	Emory	MFR
Deniz Aksoy	Princeton	MFR
John Aldrich	Duke	PI, Instructor
James Alt	Harvard	PI
Stephen Ansolabehere	Harvard	Instructor
Phil Arena	Essex	MFR
Scott Ashworth	Chicago	PI, Instructor
Anna Bassi	UNC-Chapel Hill	MFR
Kathleen Bawn	UCLA	PI
Brett Benson	Vanderbilt	MFR
Daniel Berger	Essex	MFR

Chris Berry	Chicago	Instructor
Fred Boehmke	U of Iowa	MFR
Adam Bonica	Stanford	MFR
Henry Brady	UC-Berkeley	PI, Instructor
Michael Brady	Denison	MFR
Jorge Bravo	Rutgers	MFR
Ethan Bueno de Mesquita	Chicago	PI, Instructor
Jennifer Bussell	UC-Berkeley	MFR
Brandice Canes-Wrone	Princeton	PI, Instructor
William Clark	Texas A&M	Instructor
Kevin Clarke	Rochester	Instructor
Josh Clinton	Vanderbilt	Instructor
Emily Clough	Newcastle University	MFR
Gary Cox	Stanford	Instructor
Scott de Marchi	Duke	PI, Instructor
Oeindrila Dube	NYU	Instructor
Catherine Eckel	Texas A&M	Instructor
Patrick Egan	NYU	MFR
Colin Elman	Maxwell School	Instructor
Songying Fang	Rice	MFR
Brian Fogarty	U of Missouri–St. Louis	MFR
James Fowler	UC Davis	Instructor
Charles Franklin	UW-Madison	Instructor
Rob Franzese	Michigan	PI, Instructor
Sean Gailmard	UC-Berkeley	PI, Instructor
Max Gallop	U of Strathclyde	MFR
Alan Gerber	Yale	Instructor
Elisabeth Gerber	Michigan	PI
Matt Golder	Penn State	Instructor
Sanford Gordon	NYU	Instructor
James Granato	Houston	Instructor
Laurel Harbridge	Northwestern	MFR
Jude Hays	Pitt	Instructor
Matias Iaryczower	Princeton	Instructor
Kosuke Imai	Princeton	Instructor
Kristin Kanthak	Pitt	MFR
Greg Koger	U of Miami	MFR
Ken Kollman	Michigan	Instructor
Keith Krehbiel	Stanford	Instructor
Bethany Lacina	Rochester	MFR
Dan Lee	UNLV	MFR
Jeffrey Lewis	UCLA	Instructor
John Londregan	Princeton	Instructor

Karen Long Jusko	Stanford	MFR
Arthur Lupia	Michigan	PI, Instructor
Jason Lyall	Yale	Instructor
Michael MacKuen	UNC-Chapel Hill	Instructor
Dan Magleby	Binghamton	MFR
Andrew Martin	Michigan	Instructor
Nolan McCarty	Princeton	Instructor
Walter Mebane	Michigan	Instructor
Adam Meirowitz	U of Utah	PI, Instructor
Jim Morrow	Michigan	Instructor
Rebecca Morton	NYU	MFR, Instructor
Sona Nadenichek Golder	Penn State	MFR
Monika Nalepa	Chicago	MFR
Brendan Nyhan	Dartmouth	MFR
Scott Page	Michigan	Instructor
John Patty	Chicago	Instructor
Elizabeth Maggie Penn	Chicago	Instructor
Michael Peress	Stony Brook	MFR
Efren Perez	Vanderbilt	Instructor
Maggie Peters	Yale	MFR
Daniel Posner	UCLA	Instructor
Carlo Prato	Northwestern	MFR
David Primo	Rochester	Instructor
Shawn Ling Ramirez	Emory	MFR
Kristopher Ramsay	Princeton	MFR, Instructor
Kirk Randazzo	South Carolina	MFR
Jason Reifler	U of Exter	MFR
Jason Roberts	UNC-Chapel Hill	MFR
Sebastian Saiegh	UC Davis	MFR
Kenneth Schultz	Stanford	Instructor
Jasjeet Sekhon	Berkeley	Instructor
Jacob Shapiro	Princeton	Instructor
Ken Shotts	Stanford	Instructor
Curtis Signorino	Rochester	Instructor
Betsy Sinclair	Washington University	Instructor
Branislav Slantchev	UC Davis	Instructor
Jim Snyder	Harvard	Instructor
Martin Steinwand	Stony Brook	MFR
Brandon Stewart	Princeton	Instructor
James Stimson	UNC-Chapel Hill	Instructor
Charles Taber	Stony Brook	Instructor
Alexander Theodoridis	UC Merced	MFR
Michael F. Thies	UCLA	MFR

Dustin Tingley	Harvard	MFR, Instructor
Rocio Titiunik	Michigan	Instructor
Vera Troeger	U of Warwick	MFR
Georg Vanberg	Duke	Instructor
Leonard Wantchekon	Princeton	Instructor
Lisa Wedeen	Chicago	Instructor
Wendy Wood	USC	Instructor
Jonathan Woon	Pitt	MFR

Appendix D. Evaluation Letters



October 18, 2016

Dear Professor XXX,

Since 2002, EITM Summer Institutes have hosted more than three hundred young scholars from over one hundred institutions, in an ongoing effort to train students to think more deeply about the conceptual and structural decisions linking theory to empirics. In addition to modules on game theory and statistical inference, recent EITM institutes have introduced students to sophisticated methods for examining qualitative data, text, “big data,” networks and related phenomena. Information about the program, including our mission statement, scholarship winners, past alumni, and details about our past institutes, can be found on our website, at <http://www.eitminstitute.org>.

The EITM Summer Institute is in the process of reviewing its past contribution to graduate training in political science in anticipation of an upcoming grant cycle. On behalf of myself and my co-PIs (Scott Demarchi, Sean Gailmard, and Arthur Lupia) I write to seek your general opinion about the EITM Summer Institute: Does EITM provide “skills added” to graduate students? Does it highlight topics and approaches that may not be covered at students’ home institutions? Does it foster diversity (racial, gender, and institutional)? Does it help professionalize graduate students? Do you encourage your students to apply to the EITM Institutes?

We realize that your time is valuable, and are not asking you to write a long letter in response to our request. An email response of a few paragraphs (or sentences!) is fine. We are simply interested in your perception of the EITM program—its strengths and shortcomings, as you have perceived them over the years. If you are unfamiliar with the EITM program we are interested in knowing that too. We hope to have your response within the next month, and it can be emailed directly to me or to Sean Gailmard at gailmard@berkeley.edu.

Let me express our sincere appreciation for considering our request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Professor Gailmard.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Maggie Penn
Professor of Political Science
University of Chicago
Email: epenn@uchicago.edu