

**Engaging with outside providers**

Effective pedagogy in the New Zealand Curriculum reinforces the importance of Health Education to be taught by teachers who (for example) create a supportive learning environment, make connections to prior learning and experience and inquire into the teaching–learning relationship (Ministry of Education, 2007).

At times, teachers may decide to use external providers to strengthen their curriculum-based approach (Ministry of Youth Development, 2004). Some external groups have knowledge and expertise that can be drawn upon when designing effective sexuality education programmes (Ministry of Education, 2015).

From the Sexuality Education Guide (page 28):

* Where outside providers are engaged, services should be incorporated within existing programmes and linked with achievement objectives from the health and physical education learning area of The New Zealand Curriculum (2007).
* Outside provider programmes and services should be evaluated alongside other learning opportunities.
* Lecture style presentations and other one-off programmes that focus on delivering information are not effective.

**Questions school leaders and teachers might ask when planning to use external providers to support the delivery of sexuality education:**

**Firstly, are our needs about seeking support for:**

1. **School wide promotion of sexual health and/or positive sexuality?**

**AND/OR**

1. **Curriculum-based sexuality education teaching and learning programmes?**

Respond to the following questions based on this consideration.

* Why are we considering using this provider?
* Is their focus and the service they offer more about school wide promotion of sexual health and positive sexuality and/or, support for curriculum-based teaching and learning programmes? What are the implications of this if using teaching and learning time for delivery?
* How is this provider funded, and what is their stated aim or purpose? What is their value-base and their ‘agenda’? How do we know this?
* What exactly is it that the organisation offers – a ‘service’ that responds to client (school/student) needs utilising a range of resource material, or a ‘programme’ of activities developed and facilitated by the provider?
* Does the provider offer a one-size-fits-all pre-planned ‘programme’ or does their approach allow for the programme and service to be adapted to respond to the needs of students at your school, and their community?
* Can I source feedback from others who have used this provider to help inform my decision about its place in your programme? What does this feedback say?
* Does this provider have a formal evaluation or review of their programme and/or services? If so, what conclusions are drawn about the quality and effectiveness of their service, and therefore how suitable it might be for our school?
* What will successful outcomes ‘look like’ if the provider delivers their service effectively? (What does the organisation’s programme or service aim to achieve?)
* What are the values of this organisation? Do they align with the values of *The New Zealand Curriculum* and the values of our school?
* Does this provider clearly and explicitly embrace the values of diversity? (Diversity related to sexuality, gender and culture.) Are their practices culturally appropriate for our students?
* What expertise do their staff bring?
* Does the organisation require police vetting of their employees/contractors? If not sure – ask.

***Support curriculum based sexuality teaching and learning programmes***

* How does this provider extend and add to learning opportunities for our students?
* How/what can they add to our existing sexuality education programme? What evidence we using to make this decision?
* How will this learning assist with addressing the health and physical education learning area achievement objectives and underlying concepts in our sexuality education programme?
* What pedagogical approaches will be used?

**Planning and evaluation checklists**

Once these initial questions have been considered, and a (likely) provider contacted the relevant version of the two **planning checklists** could be used when engaging with outside providers to:

1. support school wide action to support positive sexuality, and
2. sexuality education teaching and learning programmes.

These checklists are designed to help teachers make critical and informed decisions about the place, purpose and value of external providers.

The remaining two checklists indicate the type of **evaluative** evidence schools should look at collecting once a provider has delivered their programme or service.

***Please adapt these lists to reflect your school needs.***
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**Checklist 1a: Considerations when planning for externally-provided teaching and learning experiences that support sexuality education in the NZC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions school leaders and teachers might ask an external provider before they run session(s) to support the delivery of a curriculum-based sexuality education teaching and learning programme:** | No evidence of this in the programme or service | Limited or unconvincing evidence | Promising evidence – but needs further clarification | Ample evidence of effective practice | **Notes** |
| 1. How will the Health teachers or curriculum experts be involved in the development of the programme, session, or learning materials? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How will/ could this programme or session link to prior learning and following learning experiences in our sexuality education programme? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What range of learning experiences and outcomes exist within the session(s)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Can this programme or session be adapted to meet the diverse learning needs of students, and the pedagogical approaches of teachers responding to learner needs? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What resources (if any) are distributed by the provider noting Q about adapting materials above |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What formative and/or summative assessment opportunities exist? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What evaluation evidence or testimonials is the provider able to provide (from students and from teachers)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What is the classroom teaching experience and qualifications of the provider who will be presenting? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. [If applicable] what is the cost to the school and what do the costs cover (eg time, resources)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall, does this provider appear to offer a service that will complement our Sexuality Education teaching and learning programme?** Why or why not? If the school has reservations, but the provider shows promise, what would need to be negotiated and changed beforethe provider contributed to the school’s sexuality education programme? |  | | | | |

**Checklist 1b: Evaluation of externally-provided NZC sexuality education teaching and learning experiences**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions school leaders and teachers may ask and reflect upon to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of an external provider supporting sexuality education in the NZC:** | No evidence available | Evidence shows this was poorly done/feedback was unfavorable | Evidence show promise but also identifies room for improvement | Evidence of effective delivery (agreed aims were met and processes followed) | **Notes** |
| 1. How well were the sessions and learning materials planned, including goals and learning outcomes? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How extensive, explicit and aligned were the links to health and physical education in the NZC? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well did the session/programme align with learning needs identified by teachers, students and whānau (as part of the community consultation process or other communications)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well did the students learn what was intended? Was there (useful) unintended learning? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well did the session and its outcomes connect to prior learning? How can the outcomes now be built upon for further learning experiences? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the learning experiences culturally responsive and effective in meeting the diverse needs of students? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the messages and information conveyed age/ developmentally-appropriate, accurate, relevant and consistent with the underlying concepts? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the programme delivered in a practical, credible, interactive and child or youth-friendly way? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did the external provider seek student and/or teacher feedback and, if appropriate, adapt their approach as a result of feedback received? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What did the students say about the session(s)? |  | | | | |
| **Would we recommend this provider/programme to other teachers in future – why or why not?** |  | | | | |

**Checklist 2a: Considerations when planning for externally-provided whole school health promotion experiences**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions school leaders and teachers might ask an external provider before they run session(s) to support the delivery of whole school positive sexuality promotion in the school:** | No evidence of this | Limited or unconvincing evidence | Promising evidence – but needs further clarification | Ample evidence of effective practice | **Notes** |
| 1. How will the school leadership, curriculum experts, teachers, and students be involved in the development of the programme, sessions? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How can this programme or session(s) link to other initiatives to support student well-being in the school? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What range of learning experiences and expected outcomes exist within the session(s)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Can this programme or session be adapted to meet the diverse needs of schools, teachers and students? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What programme evaluation measures exist? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What evaluation evidence or testimonials is the provider able to offer (from students and from teachers)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What is the expected/ideal delivery model – is the time involved in/out of class? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What resources (if any) are provided? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. [If applicable] what is the cost to the school and what do the costs cover (eg time, resources)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall, does this provider appear to offer a service that will complement our Sexuality Education teaching and learning programme and make a positive contribution to the well-being of students at our school?**  Why or why not? *If the school has reservations, but the provider shows promise, what would need to be negotiated and changed before**the provider contributed to the school’s sexuality education programme?* |  | | | | |

**Checklist 2b: Evaluation of externally-provided whole school positive sexuality / health promotion experiences**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions school leaders and teachers may ask and reflect upon to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of an external provider supporting whole school positive sexuality / health promotion experiences:** | No evidence available | Evidence shows this was poorly done/feedback was unfavorable | Evidence show promise but also identifies room for improvement | Evidence of effective delivery (agreed aims were met and processes followed) | **Notes** |
| 1. How well were the sessions and learning materials planned, including goals and learning outcomes? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How extensive, explicit and aligned were the links school goals and priorities? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well did the programme/sessions complement the NZC HPE sexuality education programme? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well did the session/programme respond to the needs identified by teachers, students and whānau (eg as part of the community consultation process)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How well met were the intended outcomes of the programme/ session(s)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the health promotion experiences culturally responsive and effective in meeting the diverse needs of students? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the messages and information conveyed age/ developmentally-appropriate, accurate, and relevant? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the programme delivered in a practical, credible, interactive and child or youth-friendly way? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did the external provider seek student feedback and/or teacher and whanau? If appropriate, did adapt their approach as a result of feedback received? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What did the students say about the session(s)? |  | | | | |
| **Would we recommend this provider/programme to other schools/ teachers in future – why or why not?** |  | | | | |