

**EIP Core Skills Survey Report  
August 17, 2011**

**Background and Methodology:**

The Early Intervention Project (EIP) conducted four-day training sessions for Elementary and Secondary School Core Team members from school districts in Connecticut. In order to assess the impact of the training, participants were tested at the beginning of training (pre), at the conclusion of the training two months later (post), and at the end of that school year to determine long-term impact (post-post).

The time periods for data collection are depicted in the chart below.

Cohort	Pre testing	Post testing	Post-post testing
Elementary Core Team sample	November 2010	February 2011	June 2011
Secondary Core Team sample	December 2010	April 2011	June 2011

A questionnaire was used to collect data. It consisted of twenty-four Agreement statements. The Agreement statements had a five point response scale:

- 1= Strongly Disagree
- 2= Disagree
- 3= Neutral
- 4= Agree
- 5= Strongly Agree

Participants were requested to complete the questionnaire online via *Survey Monkey*. Data from each testing session were downloaded into EXCEL files and then imported into SPSS for data analysis. The six data sets were transposed so that each could be entered into SPSS for data analysis. The eight-digit ID numbers were used to match sets of pre, post and post-post data. The numbers of respondents by participating school are reported in Table 1.

**Table 1: Potential Matches from each Data Set**

<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Pre tests</b>	<b>Post tests</b>	<b>Post-Post tests</b>
<b>DH Ferrara</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>King St.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Stadley Rough</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
N=22	22 (100%)	17 (77%)	11 (55%)
<b>Secondary</b>	<b>Pre tests</b>	<b>Post tests</b>	<b>Post-Post tests</b>
<b>Dag Hammarskjold</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Southington High</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Bacon Academy</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Rogers Park</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Moran Middle</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Portland Middle</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
N=44	44 (100%)	39 (89%)	23 (52%)

A **Total Score on the EIP Core Skills** training instrument was calculated by summing up the 24 items based on their 5 point ratings. Two items were reverse scored and had to be recoded for summing. Therefore, the lowest score possible was 24 and the highest score, 120. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient yielded a reliability statistics of .70 to .83; this is very satisfactory.

## **Results: Elementary School Core Team Members**

### ***PRE to POST TESTING***

There was a statistically significant gain in Total Scores from pre to post testing for Elementary school level participants. The mean score at pre testing was 75 (63%) and at post-testing, 80 (67%).

There were six individual items that contributed to the gains. These were:

- ✓ Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school’s data.

- ✓ I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.
- ✓ EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.
- ✓ I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.
- ✓ We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.
- ✓ We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.

For each of these items the mean scores rose and the gain was statistically significant. Please see Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**Elementary School Pre testing and Post testing Results**  
**[Matched Pairs =15]**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
1. I believe we can teach all students.	<b>Pre</b>	4.87	15	.352	.00	14	1.000
	<b>Post</b>	4.87	15	.352			
2. I believe all students can learn.	<b>Pre</b>	4.87	15	.352	-.56	14	.58
	<b>Post</b>	4.93	15	.258			
3. Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.	<b>Pre</b>	4.00	15	.845	-2.20	14	.045*
	<b>Post</b>	4.60	15	.632			
4. I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.	<b>Pre</b>	3.73	15	.704	-4.00	14	.00**
	<b>Post</b>	4.53	15	.516			
5. Our school staff sees EIP as the pre-referral process to Special Education. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	<b>Pre</b>	2.53	15	.990	.00	14	1.000
	<b>Post</b>	2.53	15	.743			
6. We have a clear EIP Process in place.	<b>Pre</b>	2.60	15	1.056	.68	14	.51
	<b>Post</b>	2.40	15	.828			
7. Team members understand that all in the school are involved in early intervening services, not just the EIP core team.	<b>Pre</b>	3.27	15	.884	.82	14	.42
	<b>Post</b>	3.07	15	1.223			
8. Our school staff easily and willingly accesses our EIP process.	<b>Pre</b>	2.87	15	.915	1.57	14	.14
	<b>Post</b>	2.47	15	.743			
9. Our staff finds the EIP paperwork cumbersome. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	<b>Pre</b>	2.07	15	.799	.81	14	.43
	<b>Post</b>	1.93	15	.704			
10. We have a clear, easy-to-use intervention planning procedure.	<b>Pre</b>	2.27	15	.594	-1.57	14	.14
	<b>Post</b>	2.67	15	.900			

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
11. We regularly interview students and families as part of our data collection process.	<b>Pre</b>	2.40	15	.632	-1.57	14	.14
	<b>Post</b>	2.80	15	.941			
12. We use data to pinpoint the focus area of improvement and determine the desired outcome.	<b>Pre</b>	3.67	15	.617	.37	14	.72
	<b>Post</b>	3.60	15	.632			
13. When considering data, assessments, instructional practices and inventions, we examine possible bias.	<b>Pre</b>	2.93	15	1.033	-1.00	14	.33
	<b>Post</b>	3.13	15	.990			
14. We determine an appropriate intervention by matching research-based strategies (when available) with student needs.	<b>Pre</b>	3.53	15	.640	.70	14	.50
	<b>Post</b>	3.40	15	.737			
15. We actively include culturally responsive practices and tools in our intervention plans.	<b>Pre</b>	2.60	15	.632	-2.10	14	.05
	<b>Post</b>	3.00	15	.756			
16. We have an effective method for monitoring student progress.	<b>Pre</b>	2.93	15	.799	.29	14	.77
	<b>Post</b>	2.87	15	.743			
17. We set a review date and evaluate student progress and the plan.	<b>Pre</b>	3.33	15	.724	1.87	14	.08
	<b>Post</b>	2.93	15	.799			
18. EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.	<b>Pre</b>	2.93	15	.594	-4.52	14	.00**
	<b>Post</b>	3.87	15	.915			
19. We have designed an effective collaborative strategic decision-making process for developing intervention plans.	<b>Pre</b>	2.53	15	.640	-1.98	14	.07
	<b>Post</b>	3.27	15	1.2			
20. Families of students with intervention plans are involved in the process in a variety of ways.	<b>Pre</b>	2.80	15	.676	-.49	14	.63
	<b>Post</b>	2.93	15	1.0			
21. I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.	<b>Pre</b>	3.53	15	.915	-3.67	14	.00**
	<b>Post</b>	4.13	15	.990			
22. We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.	<b>Pre</b>	2.93	15	.799	-4.67	14	.00**
	<b>Post</b>	4.00	15	.535			
23. We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.	<b>Pre</b>	2.87	15	.743	-3.29	14	.00**
	<b>Post</b>	3.67	15	.816			
24. Our team is functioning at the performing stage.	<b>Pre</b>	2.67	15	.617	.000	14	1.000
	<b>Post</b>	2.67	15	.617			
<b>Total Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>74.73</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6.45</b>	<b>-2.79</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>.014*</b>

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Total Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>80.27</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8.83</b>			

***PRE to POST-POST TESTING***

There was a statistically significant gain in Total Scores from pre to post-post testing for Elementary school level participants. The mean score at pre testing was 76 (63%) and at post-testing, 89 (74%). However, only 55% of the original cohort of elementary school team members completed the post-post test.

There were eleven individual items that contributed to the gains. These were:

- ✓ I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.
- ✓ Our staff DOES NOT find the EIP paperwork cumbersome. (reverse coded)
- ✓ We have a clear, easy-to-use intervention planning procedure.
- ✓ We regularly interview students and families as part of our data collection process.
- ✓ When considering data, assessments, instructional practices and inventions, we examine possible bias
- ✓ We determine an appropriate intervention by matching research-based strategies (when available) with student needs.
- ✓ We actively include culturally responsive practices and tools in our intervention plans.
- ✓ We have an effective method for monitoring student progress.
- ✓ EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.
- ✓ We have designed an effective collaborative strategic decision-making process for developing intervention plans.
- ✓ I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.

For each of these items the mean scores rose and the gain was statistically significant. Please see Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Elementary School Pre testing and Post-post testing Results**  
**Matched Pairs =11**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
1. I believe we can teach all students.	Pre	4.73	11	.467	.00	10	1.00
	Post	4.73	11	.467			
2. I believe all students can learn.	Pre	4.73	11	.467	.00	10	1.00
	Post	4.73	11	.467			
3. Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.	Pre	3.82	11	.603	.00	10	1.00
	Post	3.82	11	.751			
4. I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.	Pre	3.64	11	.674	-3.13	10	.01**
	Post	4.27	11	.467			
5. Our school staff sees EIP as the pre-referral process to Special Education. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	2.27	11	1.104	-1.25	10	.24
	Post	2.82	11	.603			
6. We have a clear EIP Process in place.	Pre	2.73	11	1.191	-1.84	10	.09
	Post	3.18	11	.982			
7. Team members understand that all in the school are involved in early intervening services, not just the EIP core team.	Pre	3.64	11	.924	-1.00	10	.34
	Post	4.09	11	.944			
8. Our school staff easily and willingly accesses our EIP process.	Pre	2.82	11	.982	-1.00	10	.34
	Post	3.09	11	.701			
9. Our staff finds the EIP paperwork cumbersome. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	1.91	11	.831	-3.13	10	.01**
	Post	2.55	11	.820			
10. We have a clear, easy-to-use intervention planning procedure.	Pre	2.18	11	.751	-4.67	10	.00***
	Post	3.45	11	.820			
11. We regularly interview students and families as part of our data collection process.	Pre	2.27	11	.647	-3.83	10	.00***
	Post	3.36	11	.809			
12. We use data to pinpoint the focus area of improvement and determine the desired outcome.	Pre	4.00	11	.447	-1.94	10	.08
	Post	4.27	11	.467			
13. When considering data, assessments, instructional practices and inventions, we examine possible bias.	Pre	3.00	11	1.000	-2.76	10	.02*
	Post	3.82	11	.751			
14. We determine an appropriate intervention by	Pre	3.73	11	.647	-2.39	10	.04*

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
matching research-based strategies (when available) with student needs.							
	Post	4.09	11	.539			
15. We actively include culturally responsive practices and tools in our intervention plans.	Pre	2.64	11	.674	-5.22	10	.00**
	Post	3.82	11	.751			
16. We have an effective method for monitoring student progress.	Pre	3.18	11	.982	-3.73	10	.00**
	Post	3.91	11	.701			
17. We set a review date and evaluate student progress and the plan.	Pre	3.64	11	.674	-.81	10	.44
	Post	3.82	11	.603			
18. EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.	Pre	2.91	11	.831	-3.61	10	.00**
	Post	3.73	11	.647			
19. We have designed an effective collaborative strategic decision-making process for developing intervention plans.	Pre	2.55	11	.820	-5.37	10	.00**
	Post	3.82	11	.603			
20. Families of students with intervention plans are involved in the process in a variety of ways.	Pre	2.73	11	.905	-1.15	10	.27
	Post	3.00	11	.632			
21. I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.	Pre	3.55	11	.934	-2.32	10	.04*
	Post	4.36	11	.505			
22. We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.	Pre	3.27	11	.786	-1.45	10	.17
	Post	3.73	11	.647			
23. We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.	Pre	3.18	11	.874	-1.00	10	.34
	Post	3.36	11	.674			
24. Our team is functioning at the performing stage.	Pre	2.82	11	.603	-1.49	10	.17
	Post	3.18	11	.603			
<b>Total Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	75.91	11	9.16	-7.09	10	.00**
<b>Total Post-Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	89.00	11	8.72			

## Results: Secondary School Core Team Members

### *PRE to POST TESTING*

There was a statistically significant gain in Total Scores from pre to post-testing for Secondary school level participants. The mean score at pre testing was 72 (60%) and at post-testing, 76 (63%). Please see Table 4.

There were a six individual items that contributed to the gains. These were:

- ✓ I believe we can teach all students.
- ✓ I believe all students can learn.
- ✓ Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.
- ✓ I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.
- ✓ I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.
- ✓ We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.

**Table 4**  
**Pre testing and Post testing Results**  
**Matched Pairs =26**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>P</b>
1. I believe we can teach all students.	Pre	4.65	26	.485	-2.132	25	.04*
	Post	4.81	26	.402			
1. I believe all students can learn.	Pre	4.73	26	.452	-2.132	25	.04*
	Post	4.88	26	.326			
2. Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.	Pre	3.19	26	1.059	-5.623	25	.00**
	Post	4.27	26	.962			
3. I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.	Pre	3.65	26	.892	-5.174	25	.00**
	Post	4.50	26	.583			
4. Our school staff sees EIP as the pre-referral process to Special Education. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	2.38	26	.983	-.515	25	.61
	Post	2.50	26	.860			
5. We have a clear EIP Process in place.	Pre	2.42	26	.857	.196	25	.85
	Post	2.38	26	.752			
6. Team members understand that all in the school are involved in early intervening services, not just the EIP core team.	Pre	3.15	26	1.084	-1.202	25	.24
	Post	3.50	26	1.241			
7. Our school staff easily and willingly accesses our EIP process.	Pre	2.65	26	.936	.750	25	.46
	Post	2.50	26	.906			

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>P</b>
8. Our staff finds the EIP paperwork cumbersome. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	2.38	26	.898	1.656	25	.11
	Post	2.15	26	.784			
9. We have a clear, easy-to-use intervention planning procedure.	Pre	2.58	26	.902	.647	25	.52
	Post	2.46	26	.811			
10. We regularly interview students and families as part of our data collection process.	Pre	2.50	26	1.105	-.724	25	.48
	Post	2.65	26	.936			
11. We use data to pinpoint the focus area of improvement and determine the desired outcome.	Pre	3.15	26	.925	.311	25	.76
	Post	3.08	26	.891			
12. When considering data, assessments, instructional practices and inventions, we examine possible bias.	Pre	2.81	26	.849	-.618	25	.54
	Post	2.92	26	.845			
13. We determine an appropriate intervention by matching research-based strategies (when available) with student needs.	Pre	2.85	26	.925	-.464	25	.65
	Post	2.92	26	.891			
14. We actively include culturally responsive practices and tools in our intervention plans.	Pre	2.92	26	.935	1.063	25	.30
	Post	2.69	26	.736			
15. We have an effective method for monitoring student progress.	Pre	2.88	26	.816	1.617	25	.12
	Post	2.58	26	.809			
16. We set a review date and evaluate student progress and the plan.	Pre	2.88	26	1.071	-.486	25	.63
	Post	3.00	26	.980			
17. EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.	Pre	2.85	26	.834	-1.158	25	.26
	Post	3.12	26	.816			
18. We have designed an effective collaborative strategic decision-making process for developing intervention plans.	Pre	2.69	26	.884	-.296	25	.77
	Post	2.73	26	.874			
19. Families of students with intervention plans are involved in the process in a variety of ways.	Pre	2.62	26	.941	-1.070	25	.29
	Post	2.88	26	.864			
20. I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.	Pre	3.69	26	.788	-4.183	25	.00**
	Post	4.35	26	.485			
21. We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.	Pre	2.92	26	.744	-2.776	25	.01*
	Post	3.46	26	.859			
22. We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.	Pre	2.96	26	.999	-.782	25	.44

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>P</b>
	Post	3.19	26	1.059			
23. Our team is functioning at the performing stage.	Pre	2.65	26	.892	-1.494	25	.15
	Post	2.92	26	1.055			
<b>Total Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	72.19	26	9.89	-2.737	25	.01*
<b>Total Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	76.46	26	9.79			

## Results: Elementary and Secondary School Core Team Members- COMBINED

### *PRE to POST TESTING*

There was a statistically significant gain in Total Scores from pre to post-testing for all EIP Core Team participants. The mean score at pre testing was 73 (60%) and at post-testing, 78 (65%). Please see Table 5.

There were a six individual items that contributed to the gains. These were:

- ✓ Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.
- ✓ I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.
- ✓ EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.
- ✓ I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.
- ✓ We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.
- ✓ We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.

**Table 5**  
**Combined Pre testing and Post testing Results**  
**Matched Pairs =41**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
1. I believe we can teach all students.	Pre	4.73	41	.45	-1.67	40	.10
	Post	4.83	41	.38			
2. I believe all students can learn.	Pre	4.78	41	.42	-1.95	40	.06
	Post	4.90	41	.30			

		Mean	N	SD	t	df	p
3. Our EIP process is designed to improve general education instruction for all students, reduce inappropriate referrals for Special Education evaluation and close the achievement gap(s) reflected in our school's data.	Pre	3.49	41	1.05	-5.67	40	.00**
	Post	4.39	41	.86			
4. I understand the purposes and goals of EIP.	Pre	3.68	41	.82	-6.61	40	.00**
	Post	4.51	41	.55			
5. Our school staff sees EIP as the pre-referral process to Special Education. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	2.44	41	.98	-.42	40	.68
	Post	2.51	41	.81			
6. We have a clear EIP Process in place.	Pre	2.49	41	.93	.60	40	.55
	Post	2.39	41	.77			
7. Team members understand that all in the school are involved in early intervening services, not just the EIP core team.	Pre	3.20	41	1.01	-.71	40	.48
	Post	3.34	41	1.24			
8. Our school staff easily and willingly accesses our EIP process.	Pre	2.73	41	.92	1.53	40	.13
	Post	2.49	41	.84			
9. Our staff finds the EIP paperwork cumbersome. <i>Reverse Coded</i>	Pre	2.27	41	.87	1.84	40	.07
	Post	2.07	41	.76			
10. We have a clear, easy-to-use intervention planning procedure.	Pre	2.46	41	.81	.49	40	.63
	Post	2.54	41	.84			
11. We regularly interview students and families as part of our data collection process.	Pre	2.46	41	.95	-1.50	40	.14
	Post	2.71	41	.93			
12. We use data to pinpoint the focus area of improvement and determine the desired outcome.	Pre	3.34	41	.86	.43	40	.67
	Post	3.27	41	.84			
13. When considering data, assessments, instructional practices and inventions, we examine possible bias.	Pre	2.85	41	.91	-1.06	40	.29
	Post	3.00	41	.89			
14. We determine an appropriate intervention by matching research-based strategies (when available) with student needs.	Pre	3.10	41	.89	.00	40	1.00
	Post	3.10	41	.86			
15. We actively include culturally responsive practices and tools in our intervention plans.	Pre	2.80	41	.84	.00	40	1.00
	Post	2.80	41	.75			
16. We have an effective method for monitoring student progress.	Pre	2.90	41	.80	1.50	40	.14

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
	Post	2.68	41	.79			
17. We set a review date and evaluate student progress and the plan.	Pre	3.05	41	.97	.42	40	.67
	Post	2.98	41	.91			
18. EIP positively affects school wide collaboration.	Pre	2.88	41	.75	-2.99	40	.00**
	Post	3.39	41	.92			
19. We have designed an effective collaborative strategic decision-making process for developing intervention plans.	Pre	2.63	41	.80	-1.78	40	.08
	Post	2.93	41	1.06			
20. Families of students with intervention plans are involved in the process in a variety of ways.	Pre	2.68	41	.85	-1.18	40	.25
	Post	2.90	41	.92			
21. I understand how EIP is a core component of SRBI.	Pre	3.63	41	.83	-5.54	40	.00**
	Post	4.27	41	.71			
22. We are using group meeting norms when we meet as a team.	Pre	2.93	41	.76	-4.80	40	.00**
	Post	3.66	41	.79			
23. We are using assigned team roles and responsibilities.	Pre	2.93	41	.91	-2.09	40	.04*
	Post	3.37	41	.99			
24. Our team is functioning at the performing stage.	Pre	2.66	41	.79	-1.31	40	.20
	Post	2.83	41	.92			
<b>Total Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>73.12</b>	41	8.80	-3.89	40	.00**
<b>Total Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>77.85</b>	41	9.52			
<b>Mean Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>3.05</b>	41	8.80	-3.89	40	.00**
<b>Mean Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>3.24</b>	41	9.52			

## Results: Testing the Development of a Self Assessment Scale

After the EIP Core Skills analyses were completed, Words & Numbers Research, Inc. reviewed the instrument and its respective 24 items, as well as the mean score results obtained. It appeared that several items were Self Assessment in nature, specifically, items 1, 2, 3, 4 18 and 21. Therefore a new scale was developed called SELFPRE and SELFPOST using the six items pre and post. The lowest score in this case could be 6 and highest, 30 given the 5 point rating scale.

Data were entered in SPSS into a new file of combined pre and post data for both elementary and secondary participants. The total number was 41 matched sets.

There were statistically significant differences for all combined participants and by level, as Table 6 depicts, on the new SELF ASSESSMENT scale.

**Table 6**  
**SELF ASSESSMENT SCALE**  
**Combined Pre testing and Post testing Results**  
**Matched Pairs =41**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>PCT</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>p</b>
Combined Elementary and Secondary	Pre	23.19	77%	41	2.39	8.32	40	.00**
	Post	26.29	87%					
<b>Mean Combined Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>3.90</b>						
<b>Mean Combined Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>4.38</b>	87%					
Elementary only	Pre	23.93	80%	15	2.54	4,58	14	.00**
	Post	26.93	90%					
<b>Mean Elementary Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>3.99</b>	80%	15	2.54	4,58	14	.00**
<b>Mean Elementary Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>4.49</b>	90%					
Secondary only	Pre	22.77	77%	26	2.34	6.86	25	.00**
	Post	25.92	87%					
<b>Mean Secondary Pretest Score</b>	<b>Pre</b>	<b>3.80</b>	77%	26	2.34	6.86	25	.00**
<b>Mean Secondary Post Test Score</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>4.32</b>	87%					

Therefore, it appears that there is merit to examining the overall EIP Core Skills Training tool for subscales or even just one subscale such as SELF ASSESSMENT. Also, it is suggested that the Item 3 be broken into three items stems - since it addresses more than one construct.