



The GOODLIFE Program Overview

February 2024

Evidence Foundation

The GOODLIFE prevention education program and learning curriculum is designed for middle and high school students. The GOODLIFE prevention education program is designed to be used as a Tier 1 or Universal intervention under the Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support (PBIS) framework (Center for PBIS, 2022a) centered at the U.S. Department of Education (Center for PBIS, 2022b). The GOODLIFE prevention education program aligned several evidence-based frameworks, including: the Search Institute's 40 Developmental Assets (Search Institute, 2022); the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration (SAMHSA) Risk and Protective Factors framework (SAMHSA, 2022), the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) framework for social-emotional learning and the research on effective mentoring (CASEL, 2022). The GOODLIFE program currently includes classroom education curriculum, small group mentoring curriculum, a 52-week self-guided social emotional learning journal experience and a playbook for peer to peer mentoring.

The GOODLIFE was designed to address risk and promote protective factors in multiple contexts including building individual resiliency (Merriam-Webster, 2022) in youth that will help ameliorate biological and psychological characteristics which may make them vulnerable to behavioral health issues. Because these factors interact with and influence one another, the GOODLIFE also targets the community context to connect youth with a caring adult such as a teacher or a coach, faith community resources and opportunities to become a role model for younger siblings and family as well as, building skills to become a mentor themselves as a young adult. The content of the prevention education curriculum was developed based on the 2015 CASEL Guide to Effective Social Emotional Learning Programs (CASEL, 2022b). We applied their systematic framework for assessing the quality of SEL programs. The content of the mentoring component of GOODLIFE was developed using all these same frameworks but with the added benefits of mentoring. The use of mentoring to address the needs of at-risk populations has grown dramatically since the mid 90's when research began to find that mentored youth were less likely to skip school or engage in alcoholic drinking/substance use, had a reduction of risk factors such as early antisocial behavior, alienation, family management problems, and lack of commitment to school. By enhancing protective factors such as healthy beliefs, opportunities for involvement, and reinforcement of prosocial behavior mentoring could have a positive impact .



The GOODLIFE is **rooted in research** to increase resilience in youth to better face the ups and downs of life; **crafted with caring in mind** paying special attention to the biopsychosocial spiritual needs of students, and **constructed with communities** in mind by including strategies for community engagement. Themes addressed by the program include:

1. Educating and bringing awareness to the importance of FOCUSing on self awareness and self control.
2. Highlighting and helping students consider the importance of FRIENDS/relationships via positive influences in their lives in addition to learning the skills of showing empathy toward others.
3. Helping students consider that they may have FREEDOM to choose when responding to their environment and to others by employing self awareness and self control.
4. Provide students with opportunities to contemplate the impact on their FUTURE and achieve goals when they apply the lessons and tools of FOCUS, FRIENDS and FREEDOM to their life.

Program Elements

1. **SELF-GUIDED READINESS FOR EVERY STUDENT “Write Your Life”**- workbook for every student. A Tier 1 and 2, weekly self-guided experience that guides students through key core competency skills using self-reflection prompt framework.
2. **TARGETED CLASSROOM TEACHING FOR EVERY STUDENT “GOODLIFE Classroom experience”**-Training for every student. A Tier 1, 5 session strategy designed using the evidence-based practices and frameworks. One of our Certified Trainers will teach each session for you.
3. **MENTORING PLAYBOOK “GOODLIFE Leadership Society”**-A framework for upperclassmen to guide incoming freshmen, or to be used in 1-on-1 or small group settings. A Tier 1 and 2, weekly conversation guide for peer-to-peer or adults mentoring students.
4. **ADVISORY PERIOD MADE SIMPLE AND DONE FOR YOU**-Daily videos and activities. A Tier 1 guided experience that helps teachers connect and care for every student while adding almost zero additional work.

Program Evaluation

Team members at the GOODLIFE have partnered with faculty at the Cedarville University School of Nursing and engaged in consultation with Dr. Tammy Collins, Certified Ohio Prevention Consultant of Marshall University, for continuous quality improvement efforts and evaluation of this innovative prevention intervention. The partnership allows for evaluation of intellectual content of the curriculum, mentoring guide, the self guided journaling experience with opportunities for further pilot projects and research replications. These activities can also provide community collaboration between the Cedarville



faculty and students in the area of health education research. Cedarville University provides access to an Institutional Review Board (IRB) for an objective review of all evaluation research which includes informed consent procedures and assurance of participant protection processes. Cedarville's status as an educational entity exempts them from the state administrative rule which requires prevention organizations to be a prevention certified organization through the Ohio Department of Mental Health & Addiction Services. These factors allow the development of a new prevention intervention while it is being evaluated for effectiveness and for quality improvement.

Cedarville faculty in consultation with the GOODLIFE developer and a Certified Ohio Prevention Consultant developed the initial evaluation plan in summer of 2020 and received IRB approval in December 2020. The first pilot was conducted in the fall semester of 2020 without evaluation in place and while the plan was evolving. The second pilot was conducted in spring semester 2021 using two of the three initial evaluation instruments. Updated IRB approval was given as IRB #E152 November of 2022.

Process Measures

1. Number of middle and high schools served
2. Number of students receiving one or more services
3. Number of classroom guides trained
4. Number of individuals engaged using GOODLIFE Leadership Society
5. Number of students attending a GOODLIFE School Assembly
6. Minimum number of student engagements with a Goodlife service

Outcome Measures

1. Increase in knowledge within one curriculum cycle measured by an electronic 4 question quiz after each classroom session, 5 sessions total.
2. Beginning Fall 2022, the team made the decision to drop the use of the Ohio State University Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) pre and post classroom program. After a detailed review of Cohort 3 data, the GOODLIFE curriculum and the OSU Resilience instrument, Drs. Delaney, Collins and Russell determined that resilience was not the construct of interest, rather social and emotional competencies. Dr. Russell presented an instrument by (Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Munoz- Morales, R. & Liorent, V. 2018. *The Latin American Journal of Psychology*, 50(2), pg. 98-106), the dimensions and psychometric properties of the social and emotional competencies questionnaire (SEC-Q) in youth and adolescents are good. Permission to use the instrument was obtained by Dr. Russell. The SEC-Q will be used with the Fall 2022 cohort and analysis of the data will follow.
3. Beginning in Cohort 2 a School Leader Survey was initiated to gain perspectives of teachers and school leaders. The survey consisted of asking about perceptions related to resilience and social emotional learning concepts.



Results

The 2022-2023 academic year is identified in the outcome measure results table as Cohort 4. Full review and incorporation of data occurs at the end of the academic year.

Process Measures	Value
Number of middle and high schools served	33
Number of students receiving one or more services	10,700
Number of classroom guides	11
Number of individuals engaged using GoodLife Leadership Society	575
Number of Students attending a GoodLife School Assembly	1,720
Minimum number of student engagements with a Goodlife service	134,335



Outcome Measure Results Table since program inception

	Pilot Program Spring 2020-2021	Cohort 2 Fall 2021-2022	Cohort 3 Fall +Spring 2021-2022 for Knowledge test & Teacher Leader Survey	Cohort 4 Fall + Spring 2023 for Knowledge Test, Teacher-Leader Survey SEC-Q	Comments
Number of Classroom Hosts	0 role not yet needed	4	same 4	11	4 New GOODLIFE Trainers added in the 2022-2023 academic year
Number of Students Participating in GL classroom program	57	1602	3120	5, 012	
12 question Knowledge Quiz Response Rate per question	Unknown	60 to 70%	60 to 67%	No longer using this Quiz-see below	*We added classroom student participation after the pilot
Knowledge Quiz individual result range pre & post classroom experience	*9 of the 15 questions were answered correctly by 90% of the students *12 of the 15 questions were answered correctly by 80% of the students *2 of the 3 questions with the lower percentage of correct answers were in the first week of the content-Get these numbers	similar results to Cohort 3	*8 of 12 questions were answered correctly by 80% or more of the students *range of scores on the other questions was 46-73%	There is now a four- question knowledge quiz that is taken pre and post classroom curriculum. When comparing pre and post scores: (See Appendix B) Additionally, in the spring 2023 cohort statistically significant increases in knowledge continued and analyzing the data filtered by middle and high school also maintained the improvement. (See Appendix D) August 2023 a 15-item instrument was developed to determine the degree to which students who participated in the GOODLIFE sessions know and understand classroom key takeaways, titled GOODLIFE Knowledge Instrument. (GKI). An expert panel completed the GKI. in September 2023. The first round will be evaluated and needed revisions will be made.	* The Pilot Program had 15 quiz questions & future cohorts had 12 after feedback analysis. *From week to week there were different numbers of students responding to the quiz after the GL content was presented. Also, it appears sometimes students started the quiz but did not finish. For further Knowledge test information see table in Appendix A



				The same expert panel will complete the revised GKI in September 2023. Following the second evaluation, the GKI will be ready and an addendum to IRB #152 will be submitted regarding the GKI, once approval is received the instrument will be ready to pilot with students in January 2024.	
OSU Resilience Score-6 Question Likert Scale Survey	Results of the independent t-test showed that the post-test resilience scores were significantly higher than the pre-test resilience scores ($t = -2.578$, $p = .012$)	Unable to score due to data gathering error & unforeseen tech challenges	See Appendix B	<p>This is the first cohort to use the SEC-Q instrument. The SEC-Q has 16 questions which are answered pre and post classroom curriculum. The SEC-Q was developed using adolescents and has strong psychometric properties.</p> <p>Results of the independent t-test between pre and post scores were statistically significant for Questions #1, #3, and #10 (See Appendix A).</p> <p>The second semester to use the SEC-Q (Spring 2023), again, pre and post scores show statistical significance for Questions #1, #3, #5, #6, #9, #10, #11 and #13 (See Appendix C)</p>	** After a detailed review of Cohort 3 data, the GOODLIFE curriculum and the OSU Resilience instrument, Drs. Delaney, Collins and Russell determined that resilience was not the construct of interest, rather social and emotional competencies. Dr. Russell presented an instrument by (Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Munoz-Morales, R. & Liorent, V. 2018. <i>The Latin American Journal of Psychology</i> , 50(2), pg. 98-106), the dimensions and psychometric properties of the social and emotional competencies questionnaire (SEC-Q) in youth and adolescents are good. Permission to use the instrument was obtained by Dr. Russell. The SEC-Q will be used with the Fall 2022 cohort and analysis of the data will follow.
Number of students participating in the GOODLIFE Leadership Society	0		By the end of the 2021-2022 academic year, across 16 schools, 200 students were participating (Cohort 2 + Cohort 3)		
“Write your life” SEL weekly student journaling experience	0		By the end of the 2021-2022 academic year, across 8 schools 5,000 “Write your life” journals were purchased	2 anecdotal feedback interviews with teaching professionals occurred and an additional expert review happened between June-August 2023 to help inform a structured evaluation plan for “Write Your Life.”	Planning is underway to determine an evaluation plan for the 2023-2024 and academic year for this item.



Teacher/Leader feedback demographics	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	*12 teachers from 8 schools-3 middle & 5 high	*14 teachers from 8 schools-8 middle & 6 high	A range from 48-58 teachers from 14 different schools responded to questions in the survey	After the pilot program we added a survey for teacher/leaders to provide feedback
Teacher/Leader observations	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	*12 of 14-86% responded the GOODLIFE SEL program “greatly increased or somewhat increased” student SEL in student program participants *11 of 14 (79%) responded the GOODLIFE SEL program “greatly increased or somewhat increased” Resilience in student program participants	*13 of 17 - 76% responded the GOODLIFE SEL program “greatly increased or somewhat increased” student SEL in student program participants *12 of 17 - 71% responded the GOODLIFE SEL program “greatly increased or somewhat increased” Resilience in student program participants	N=58 84% of respondents reported observing a “somewhat or great” increase in social emotional knowledge in students who participated in the GOODLIFE education and mentoring program. N=58 72% of respondents reported observing a “somewhat or great” increase in resilience in students who participated in the GOODLIFE education and mentoring program.	
Teacher/Leader observations	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	*Areas of observed student behavior from teachers/leaders rated -”somewhat or greatly increased” (12 of 14=86%) of the areas listed below: -Emotional awareness -Emotional regulation & focus -Recognizing	*Areas of observed student behavior from teachers/leaders rated -”somewhat or greatly increased” of the areas listed below: -Emotional awareness-87% (15) -Emotional regulation & focus-69% (13) -Recognizing & Respecting the feelings & perspectives of others-80% (15) -Further establishing and maintaining cooperative relationships-71% (14) -Further independent	N=54 *Areas of observed student behavior from teachers/leaders rated -”somewhat or greatly increased” of the areas listed below: -Emotional awareness- 85% -Emotional regulation & focus- 81% -Recognizing & Respecting the feelings & perspectives of others- 85% -Further establishing and maintaining cooperative relationships- 79% -Further independent decision making- 83% -Further problem solving in groups- 83%	Further data dive between Cohort 2 & 3



		& Respecting the feelings & perspectives of others -Further problem solving in groups	decision making-69% (13) -Further problem solving in groups-67% (15)		
Teacher/Leader observations	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	Added this question for COHORT 3	N=15 80% As a leader in your school, how relevant was the GOODLIFE content for your students?	This question was not included in this cohort.	
Teacher/leader Process feedback-GL program was easy to implement	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	*N=13 100% “definitely easy to implement”	*N=16 75% “definitely easy to implement”	N=48 96% (95.83%) of respondents reported feeling the GOODLIFE program was “definitely or somewhat” easy to implement. *77.08%- “Definitely easy” *18.75- “Somewhat easy”	
Teacher/Leader Process feedback	*Received positive verbal feedback which lead to the creation of the teacher/leader survey	*N=12 75% “I had all of the information I needed to implement GL”	*N=15 53%-All information 80%-All & Most information “I had all of the information I needed to implement GL program	N=48 62.5% -All information 83% -All & Most information “I had all of the information I needed to implement GL program	



At the beginning of the 2022-2023 academic year the Cleft/GOODLIFE PROGRAM grew from 17 to 33 different schools.

After reviewing results from the 2021-2022 academic year, the evaluation team investigated the possibility of changing the survey tool to measure resilience. By mid-July the Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q- Appendix C) was identified, articles reporting the dimensions and the psychometric properties were reviewed, and permission to use the tool was gained. The tool is designed to specifically be used in the middle & high school setting. The new tool was integrated into the Cleft/GOODLIFE program beginning in the 2022-2023 fall semester. Since the SEC-Q instrument was a 16 item questionnaire and we had historically been having positive improvements in student knowledge regarding the GOODLIFE content, we decided to shorten the knowledge test from 12 (3 questions/classroom session) to 4 questions (1 question/classroom session). Additionally, in October 2022, a new Institute Review Board (IRB) application was submitted and approved by the Cedarville University IRB.

IRB #E152 (Evaluating impacts of the GOODLIFE Curriculum and Mentoring Program on Content Knowledge and Resilience in Middle and High school Students) is approved as exempt (category #2)

An addendum to IRB #E152 to add Rutherford County Schools in North Carolina (Middle and High Schools) to the research project (Evaluating the impacts of the GOODLIFE Curriculum and Mentoring Programs on Content Knowledge and Resilience in Middle and High School Students) was approved on April 27, 2023.

In December of 2022, the evaluation team met and reviewed results from fall semester which included classroom observation. In regards to the new SEC-Q tool, 1171 students completed the pre test survey and 809 completed the post test survey. The post test results showed significant increases in the area of students being able to label their emotions (Question #1-alpha value of .05, $t(1978) = -3.07$, $p = .002$), ability to differentiate one emotion from another (Question #3 alpha value of .05, $t(1977) = -2.94$, $p = .003$), and not making decisions carefully (Question #10-alpha value of .05, $t(1978) = -2.16$, $p = .031$). The team was curious about the difference in the student pre to post test completion rate and if changing the process of when post test survey completion occurred within the classroom content would offer a more focused time for students as currently survey completion was at the same time as merchandise distribution. These changes were made for the January 2023 semester start. Next, summary evaluation is planned for June 2023. See Appendix C & E for the results of the SEC-Q for Spring 2023.



Additionally, between October 2022 and June 2023, a School Leader Feedback survey was distributed via Qualtrics survey. A range of 48 to 58 leaders responded to the survey questions from 14 different schools. Result highlights include:

1. 84% of respondents reported observing a “somewhat or great” increase in social emotional knowledge in students who participated in the GOODLIFE education and mentoring program.
2. 72% of respondents reported observing a “somewhat or great” increase in resilience in students who participated in the GOODLIFE education and mentoring program.
3. 96% of respondents reported feeling the GOODLIFE program was “definitely or somewhat” easy to implement.
4. School Leader Comments:
 - a. “Our students talk about it after you leave. That resonates as to leaving an impact on them, long after you're gone.”
 - b. “It is all amazing and the kids genuinely like it!”
 - c. “Bringing attention and intention to student self-behaviors, introducing a different way to look at their own lives to determine "Is it best"?, the "codes" and hacks for life”
 - d. “Connections with the GOODLIFE coach and my students. They looked forward to having our GOODLIFE coach (Mr. Kyle) in class each and every time he was here. I do not have enough great things to say about our GOODLIFE coach!”

In December 2023, the evaluation team decided to evolve the gathering of information regarding the knowledge tool. After team discussion and review of previous results we created the GOODLIFE Knowledge & Perception Instrument (GKPI). Dr. Anne Russell created this tool based upon review of curriculum, review of previous knowledge tests, and previous results. The initial tool was presented to an expert panel for review and input. The tool was revised based upon feedback from the expert panel and discussion from the evaluation team. On 2/7/24 the new tool was incorporated into the IRB proposal and the IRB approved its use. (*“Amendment to #152 is approved.” Cedarville University IRB, M. Scherr-Chair*)



References

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (retrieved 2022, January 13a). What is the CASEL framework?

<https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-is-the-casel-framework/>

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (retrieved 2022, January 13b). Program guide. <https://pg.casel.org/>

Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (retrieved 2022, January 13a). Tiered framework.

<https://www.pbis.org/pbis/tiered-framework#:~:text=Tier%201%3A%20Universal%20Prevention%20>

Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (retrieved 2022, January 13b). About the center. <https://www.pbis.org/about/about>

Merriam-Webster. ("Resilient,"retrieved 2022, January 13).

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilient>

Ohio Department of Health. (retrieved 2022, January 14). Ohio Healthy Youth Environment Survey.

<https://ohyes.ohio.gov/>

Panorama for Social Emotional Learning. (retrieved 2022, January 14).

<https://www.panoramaed.com/social-emotional-learning-sel>

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (retrieved 2022, January 13).Risk and protective factors.

<https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/20190718-samhsa-risk-protective-factors.pdf>

Search Institute. (retrieved 2022, January 13). The developmental assets framework.

<https://www.search-institute.org/our-research/development-assets/developmental-assets-framework/>



Smith, B.W. et al. (2008). The Brief Resilience Scale: Assessing the Ability to Bounce Back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15(3), 37-41. doi: 10.1080/10705500802222972

Zych et al. (2018) Dimensions and Psychometric Properties of the Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q) in youth and adolescents. vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 98-106, 2018
<https://www.redalyc.org/journal/805/80557847003/html/>



Appendix A

Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q) (5-point Likert Scale)
 Cohort 4 Fall 2022
 Independent t-test
 alpha level .05

Question	N	<i>t= value</i>	<i>p= value</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. I know how to label my emotions	1,980	-3.07	.002	1.06
2. I am aware of the thoughts that influence my emotions.	1,980	-1.33	.183	0.98
3. I differentiate one emotion from another.	1,980	-2.94	.003	0.99
4. I know how my emotions influence what I do.	1,978	0.33	.739	0.99
5. I know how to motivate myself.	1,978	-1.71	.087	1.21
6. I have my goals clear.	1,978	-1.47	.143	1.18
7. I pursue my objectives despite the difficulties.	1,978	-1.67	.095	1.02
8. I make decisions analyzing carefully possible consequences.	1,978	-0.73	.464	1.08
9. I usually consider advantages and disadvantages of each option before I make decisions.	1,978	-0.73	.468	1.09



10. I do not make decisions carelessly.	1,978	-2.16	.031	1.16
11. I know what people expect from others.	1,978	-1.43	.152	1.01
12. I pay attention to the needs of others.	1,978	0.53	.599	0.96
13. I usually know how to help others who need that.	1,978	-1.49	.137	1.01
14. I have good relationships with my classmates or workmates.	1,978	-0.01	.990	1.04
15. I usually listen in an active way.	1,978	-0.18	.857	1.00
16. I offer help to those who need me.	1,978	1.62	.105	0.96

Questions #1, #3, and #10 were statistically significant findings on the SEC-Q

Appendix B

Four Question Knowledge Quiz

Cohort 4

Fall 2022

Independent t-test, alpha level .05

Question	Pre-Test			Post-Test			Significance	
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>



1. What should we do with tension?	2,416	2.31	0.74	1,927	2.79	0,52	-25.08	<.001
2. Relationships.	2,416	2.49	0.74	1,927	2.86	0.45	-20.21	<.001
3. Before making a decision, what is the best question to ask yourself to help you make a great decision?	2,416	2.33	0.59	1,927	2.75	0.49	-25.59	<.001
4. What equals the results of your life?	2,416	1.67	0.70	1,927	1.12	0.41	32.32	<.001

All four questions from the Short Knowledge quiz were statistically significant. Question #4 had a higher pre test score than post test score. This may be related to wording of the question.

Appendix C

Social and Emotional Competencies Questionnaire (SEC-Q) (5-point Likert Scale)
 Cohort 4 Spring 2023
 Independent t-test, alpha level .05

Question	N	<i>t= value</i>	<i>p= value</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. I know how to label my emotions	3,521	-3.43	<.001	1.09
2. I am aware of the thoughts that influence my emotions.	3,504	-1.67	.096	1.04



3. I differentiate one emotion from another.	3,482	-3.40	<.001	1.06
4. I know how my emotions influence what I do.	3,477	-0.51	.612	1.05
5. I know how to motivate myself.	3,506	-2.42	.015	1.22
6. I have my goals clear.	3,490	-2.84	.005	1.21
7. I pursue my objectives despite the difficulties.	3,469	-1.49	.137	1.08
8. I make decisions analyzing carefully possible consequences.	3,491	-2.09	..036	1.14
9. I usually consider advantages and disadvantages of each option before I make decisions.	3,512	-3.56	<.001	1.11
10. I do not make decisions carelessly.	3,493	-3.91	<.001	1.17
11. I know what people expect from others.	3,471	-3.92	<.001	1.07



12. I pay attention to the needs of others.	3,475	-0.47	.639	1.02
13. I usually know how to help others who need that.	3,482	-2.62	.009	1.04
14. I have good relationships with my classmates or workmates.	3,507	-0.63	.532	1.07
15. I usually listen in an active way.	3,505	-1.91	.056	1.04
16. I offer help to those who need me.	3,515	0.05	.964	1.03

Questions # 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 ,11 & 13 were statistically significant from the SEC-Q.



Appendix D

Four Question Knowledge Quiz
 Cohort
 Spring 2023
 Independent t-test. alpha level .05

Question	Pre-Test			Post-Test			Significance	
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
1. What should we do with tension?	3078	0.47	0.50	3101	0.84	0.36	-33.65	< .001
2. Relationships.	3078	0.63	0.48	3101	0.89	0.31	-24.92	< .001
3. Before making a decision, what is the best question to ask yourself to help you make a great decision?	3078	0.54	0.50	3101	0.22	0.41	27.85	< .001
4. What equals the results of your life?	3076	0.47	0.50	3102	0.91	0.28	-42.92	< .001



Overall Sum	3079	2.11	1.02	3102	2.86	0.68	-34.15	< .001
Middle Schools	973	2.09	1.01	904	2.86	0.64	-19.83	< .001
High Schools	1048	2.08	1.04	1122	2.85	0.67	-20.26	< .001

All four questions from the Short Knowledge quiz were statistically significant. Question #3 had a higher pre test score than post test score.



Appendix E

Overall SEC-Q Sum Scores
Spring 2023
Middle and High Schools

Two-Tailed Independent Samples t-Test for Sum by Pre and Post, (α .05)

There were no statistically significant differences when using the t-Test in the data from the schools listed in the table. However, the Mann-Whitney test was also used and there were a few statistically significant differences identified between Pre and Post scores.

- The mean (M) values highlighted in green showed an increase in the score from pre to post, but was not statistically significant. Although there were no statistically significant results, there was an increase in SEC-Q from pre to post test using t-Test, when a Mann-Whitney in the middle and high school groups statistical significance is shown.

Schools	Pre-test			Post-test				
All Middle Schools (<i>t-Test</i>)	60.21	10.08	1187	61.00	12.31	869	-1.50	.133
All Middle Schools (<i>Mann-Whitney Test</i>)	1,002.08	-	1187	1,064.581	-	869	<i>U 484.394.00</i>	.018



All High Schools <i>(t-Test)</i>	59.82	10.19	1151	60.78	12.63	989	-1.93	.053
All High Schools <i>(Mann-Whitney Test)</i>	1,027.35	-	1151	1,120.72	-	989	<i>U</i> 519,503	< .001