Evaluating Interrelate's School Education Programs: Kids ConneXions

Sallie Newell  
Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University

Anne Graham  
Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University

Publication details  
Newell, S & Graham, A 2011, Evaluating Interrelate’s School Education Programs: Kids ConneXions, report prepared for Interrelate Family Centres, Sydney, NSW.
EVALUATING INTERRELATE’S SCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: KIDS CONNEXIONS

July 2011

Prepared by:
Dr Sallie Newell
Professor Anne Graham

Additional copies of this report:
Can be accessed at http://epubs.scu.edu.au/ccyp_pubs/33

Acknowledgments
The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge:
- The children and teachers who completed the program evaluation forms.
- The Interrelate Educators who facilitated the distribution and collection of the evaluation forms with their Kids Connexions groups.
- Michelle Wilson and Alison Moss for their assistance with the collation, data entry and coding of the Kids Connexions evaluation forms.
- Interrelate Family Centres for engaging and partnering with us throughout this project.
- The Widjabul People and the Ngundawal Minjungbal People of the Bundjalung Nation, the Arakwal People and the Gumbaynggirr People. As the Traditional Custodians of the land where our University campuses are located, we pay tribute to the unique role they play in the life of our region.

For further information please contact: Dr Sallie Newell – Senior Research Officer
Phone: 02 6620 3802 Fax: 02 6620 3243 Email: sallie.newell@scu.edu.au

© 2011 Centre for Children and Young People
This work may be reproduced, in whole or part, for study or training purposes, subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgement of the source. It should not be used for commercial purposes.

The Centre welcomes feedback on both the development and implementation of this document from our partners. The Centre considers that collaboration with individuals, professionals, service providers and academic colleagues concerned with children can lead to better outcomes for children and young people.
# Table of Contents

**Report Summary** .................................................................................................................. 1  
**Introduction** .......................................................................................................................... 3  
  - **Background** ......................................................................................................................... 3  
  - **Interrelate's Current School Education Programs** ............................................................... 3  
  - **Purpose of this Report** ......................................................................................................... 4  
  - **More About the Kids Connexions Program** ...................................................................... 4  
**Methods** .................................................................................................................................. 6  
  - **Tools Used to Evaluate the KC Program** .......................................................................... 6  
  - **Data Collection** .................................................................................................................... 6  
  - **Data Analyses** ..................................................................................................................... 6  
  - **Ethics** .................................................................................................................................. 6  
**Results** ..................................................................................................................................... 7  
  - **Sample Characteristics** ....................................................................................................... 7  
  - **Teacher Satisfaction with the KC Program** ...................................................................... 8  
  - **Perceived Student Learnings** ............................................................................................. 10  
    - Awareness of What Constitutes a 'Relationship' ................................................................. 10  
    - Understanding Their Own Relationship Skills ................................................................... 11  
    - Understanding Healthy and Unhealthy Relationships ....................................................... 12  
    - Confidence to Leave an Unhealthy Relationship .............................................................. 13  
**Appendices** ............................................................................................................................ 14  
  - **Appendix A: Student Pre Evaluation Form – KC Program** ........................................... 14  
  - **Appendix B: Student Post Evaluation Form – KC Program** ......................................... 15  
  - **Appendix C: Teacher Evaluation Form – KC Program** .................................................. 16  
  - **Appendix D: Schools Included in Evaluating the KC Program** .................................... 17
Kids ConneXions (KC) is one of six relationship and sexuality education programs delivered by Interrelate Family Centres. It involves two 90-minute class-based sessions, designed to improve Year 5 and 6 students’ understanding about and development of healthy relationships and to support them to make healthy choices and build resilience in their relationships. The KC program involves a variety of creative activities and teaching methods, is facilitated by specially trained Educators and correlates well to the NSW Board of Studies’ PD/H/PE syllabus. This evaluation report is based on data collected from 84 KC groups using surveys developed by Interrelate, as part of the KC program’s development.

Teachers were extremely satisfied with the KC program. Almost all teachers agreed that the KC program involved suitable activities and resources, was enjoyable and useful for their students, fulfilled their own expectations and catered for students with varying ability levels. These very positive satisfaction ratings were supported by teachers’ additional written comments, with 85% offering positive feedback about the KC program’s approach, activities, resources, content and/or Educator. One-fifth of the teachers also suggested ways the KC program’s content, approach or resources may be improved and one-third suggested additional needs which could be covered.

Students consistently reported having found the KC program a useful learning experience. Students reported moderate-high levels of learning the four key evaluation topics: 1) awareness of what constitutes a ‘relationship’; 2) understanding their own relationship skills; 3) understanding healthy and unhealthy relationships; and 4) their confidence to leave an unhealthy relationship. There were very statistically significant Pre-Post increases in the proportion of students believing they could bring ‘mostly good stuff’ to their relationships and reporting they were likely and confident in their ability to assess the healthiness of their relationships. On face value, the data also suggest that the KC program may be of greater benefit for students already more confident in their relationship skills, with bigger post-program improvements perceived by students reporting the highest Pre Survey ratings in relation to knowing their relationship strengths and weaknesses and feeling confident in their ability to leave a bad relationship. However, these differences could also reflect an acknowledgment that the initially high self-ratings may, with hindsight, not have been entirely accurate.

Although the lack of age and gender data prohibited any such sub-group comparisons in relation to the students’ learnings from the KC program, no significant differences were found when comparing students from Year 6 only classes with those from the mixed or exclusively-lower classes.

The reasonably high proportion of students completing the evaluation enhance confidence in the findings presented, although they could be further strengthened by including satisfaction questions in the student survey, as well as an open-ended question about their main learning. Interrelate could also consider additional evaluative processes to explore the extent and nature of any longer-term impacts associated with participating in the KC program.

In the meantime, Interrelate can confidently promote the existing KC program as an appropriate, curriculum-relevant and effective way of introducing senior primary students to a range of relationship issues.
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND
In 1926, Interrelate Family Centres (Interrelate) began its Father and Son and Mother and Daughter programs, delivering sexuality education to young people in New South Wales. Quality educational programs have remained a key component of Interrelate’s expanding range of services and their dedicated and enthusiastic School Services team has earned a reputation as ‘a respected and trusted leader in the delivery of sexuality and relationship education in NSW schools’.

INTERRELATE’S CURRENT SCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
In working towards their vision of being a ‘lighthouse’ organisation for recognising children, Interrelate now offers a suite of six relationship and sexuality education programs for NSW children and their families. Each program is facilitated by specially trained Educators and has a clearly articulated structure, content and objectives, with the class-based programs having been correlated against the NSW Board of Studies’ PD/H/PE syllabus:

- **Where Did I Come From?** – one 60-minute evening group session for students in Years 3-6 and their families – designed to inform students about the male and female reproductive systems, conception, foetal development, birth and the different ways in which children can join families and to facilitate parent-child discussions on these topics;

- **Preparing for Puberty** – one 60-minute evening group session for students in Years 5-6 and their families – designed to inform students about the physical, emotional, social and intellectual changes associated with puberty (for boys and for girls) and to facilitate parent-child discussions on these topics;

- **Minding Me** – two 90-minute class-based sessions for students in Year 5 – designed to provide students with information and strategies to help them navigate the physical, emotional, social and intellectual changes they may experience during puberty: Session 1 deals specifically with how relationships may change and developing mutual respect and good conflict resolution skills among students; Session 2 introduces the physical changes of male and female puberty and develops students’ skills for identifying and addressing emotional and personal safety issues within their relationships;

- **Moving into the Teen Years** – a series of four 90-minute class-based sessions for students in Year 6 (with a take-home workbook to encourage parental engagement) – designed to enhance students’ self-esteem, communication and decision-making skills (including taking care of themselves and taking responsibility), to provide in-depth information about boys’ and girls’ bodies, the changes they can expect during puberty, reproduction and sexuality education;

- **Raising Awareness of Bullying** – one 60-minute (younger groups) or 90-minute (older groups) class-based session with four age-tailored versions for students in each of Years 3, 4, 5 & 6 – designed to assist schools with concerns about harassment and/or physical abuse amongst pupils: Each session identifies the nature of bullying (including cyber bullying for older groups) and presents strategies for dealing with bullies from both victim and bystander perspectives; and, most recently,

- **Kids ConneXions** – two 90-minute class-based sessions for students in Year 6 – designed to improve students’ understanding about and development of healthy relationships and to support them to make healthy choices and to build resilience in their relationships.
PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

In March 2010, Interrelate Family Centres commissioned Southern Cross University’s Centre for Children & Young People to refine their existing program evaluation tools and, then, to use these new tools to conduct a large-scale evaluation of the above education programs.

This report is one in a series of six presenting the results of this large-scale evaluation: There are separate reports for each of the four class-based program, a combined report covering the two evening programs and, finally, a Consolidated Report which brings together the key findings across all six programs.

This report provides further background and describes the tool development and evaluation results for the program entitled Kids ConneXions.

MORE ABOUT THE KIDS CONNEXIONS PROGRAM

Introduced in May 2010, Kids ConneXions (KC) is the most recent addition to Interrelate’s school education programs. It is available year-round, on a fee-for-service basis (at a current cost of $16 per student for the two-session program) to NSW schools.

The KC program involves a variety of creative activities and teaching methods (including role plays, discussions, handouts, slideshow diagrams and games), developed for students in Years 5 and 6, with the overall aim of building resilience in their relationships, by:

- Increasing children’s recognition and understanding of:
  - healthy and unhealthy relationships;
  - the many different types of relationships;
  - their right to be safe in a relationship;
  - their own social and support network; and
  - the impact of their relationship choices on others.

- Increasing children’s skills and strategies in:
  - making healthy relationship choices;
  - maintaining healthy relationships;
  - managing unhealthy relationships;
  - being safe in relationships; and
  - problem solving and communication.

- Increasing children’s confidence in:
  - their relationship strengths;
  - being assertive when relationships are unsafe or unhealthy;
  - their sense of belonging; and
  - seeking support.

- Increasing teachers’ understanding of:
  - children who may be experiencing multiple vulnerabilities; and
  - children who may be at risk.
The KC program’s content has been correlated against the NSW Board of Study’s Personal Development, Health & Physical Education (PD/H/PE) curriculum, in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Kids Connexions: Correlation to the NSW BOS PD/H/PE Curriculum</strong></th>
<th><strong>The KC Program Encourages Students To:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PD/H/PE Curriculum Components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating 3.1: Communicates confidently in a variety of situations</td>
<td>• Use negotiation skills in group activities, eg games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making 3.2: Makes informed decisions and accepts responsibility for consequences</td>
<td>• Evaluate personal decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting 3.3: Acts in ways that enhance the contribution of self and others in a range of cooperative situations</td>
<td>• Accept responsibility for their decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting 3.3: Acts in ways that enhance the contribution of self and others in a range of cooperative situations</td>
<td>• Use strategies to resolve conflict eg negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving 3.5: Suggests, considers and selects appropriate alternatives when resolving problems</td>
<td>• Express and act appropriately on concern for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving 3.5: Suggests, considers and selects appropriate alternatives when resolving problems</td>
<td>• Select the most appropriate solution to a given problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth &amp; Development 3.9: Explains and demonstrates strategies for dealing with life changes</td>
<td>• Reflect on outcomes of chosen solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth &amp; Development 3.9: Explains and demonstrates strategies for dealing with life changes</td>
<td>• Demonstrate assertive ways to deal with different types of harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</td>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11:</strong> Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11: Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
<td>• Discuss how they relate to people in various contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11: Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
<td>• Identify their roles and responsibilities within various groups, eg: family, friends, team, class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11: Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
<td>• Develop and maintain a personal network of trusted adults who could provide advice and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11: Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
<td>• Analyse the effects of actions that enhance or disrupt relationships, eg: peer influences, drug use, bullying, mediating, active listening, prejudice, violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships 3.11: Describes roles and responsibilities in developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
<td>• Demonstrate acceptable ways of resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Living 3.13: Describes safe practices that are appropriate to a range of situations and environments</td>
<td>• Model behaviour that reflects sensitivity to the needs, rights, feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Living 3.13: Describes safe practices that are appropriate to a range of situations and environments</td>
<td>• Describe the factors that can influence communication eg listening, expression, feelings, peer pressure, body language, drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Living 3.13: Describes safe practices that are appropriate to a range of situations and environments</td>
<td>• Practise assertive ways to deal with different types of harassment or coercion eg pressure to use drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Devise strategies to cope with life changes eg puberty, changing friendships, commencing high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Discuss how they relate to people in various contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Identify their roles and responsibilities within various groups, eg: family, friends, team, class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Develop and maintain a personal network of trusted adults who could provide advice and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Analyse the effects of actions that enhance or disrupt relationships, eg: peer influences, drug use, bullying, mediating, active listening, prejudice, violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 1: A student refers to a sense of their own worth and dignity</td>
<td>• Demonstrate acceptable ways of resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 2: A student respects the rights of others to hold different values and attitudes to their own</td>
<td>• Model behaviour that reflects sensitivity to the needs, rights, feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 2: A student respects the rights of others to hold different values and attitudes to their own</td>
<td>• Describe the factors that can influence communication eg listening, expression, feelings, peer pressure, body language, drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 2: A student respects the rights of others to hold different values and attitudes to their own</td>
<td>• Practise assertive ways to deal with different types of harassment or coercion eg pressure to use drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Devise strategies to respond to risky and dangerous situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Value themselves as an important member of various groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Accept themselves as they grow and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Express a realistic perception of their personal capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Appreciate and accept the importance of developing a personal value system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Show sensitivity to the needs, rights, feelings and efforts of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Question forms of discrimination against people on the grounds of their sex, race, marital status, sexuality or disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Recognise the contribution they and others make to social living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Display a commitment to developing and maintaining positive relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Value positive relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Appreciate the important contributions they can make to various groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values 3: A student enjoys a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Value the need to work cooperatively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS

TOOLS USED TO EVALUATE THE KC PROGRAM
As the KC program was still in its ‘pilot’ year, Interrelate was keen to use existing evaluation tools, which had been developed in conjunction with the program’s content and with input from participating young people. Therefore, this evaluation is based on data collected using those tools, which included Pre and Post surveys for completion by participating students and Post-only surveys for their accompanying teachers. Included in Appendices A, B and C, the student surveys focussed exclusively on their understanding and capacity in relation to the topics covered while the teacher survey focussed on their experience of attending the KC program.

DATA COLLECTION
All KC-trained Educators used these Interrelate-developed evaluation tools as a routine part of facilitating their KC groups during the study period, which comprised Terms 2 and 3 of the 2010 school year. The Pre Student surveys were completed at the beginning of each group’s first KC session while the Post Student and Teacher evaluation forms were distributed at the end of their second KC session, usually for immediate completion although some forms were returned later (where groups had insufficient time during or after their session). The KC Coordinator entered the completed surveys into a Microsoft Access database, which was then forwarded to the CCYP for coding, cleaning and analyses.

DATA ANALYSES
All survey data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. Basic descriptive statistics (eg: means, counts and/or percentages) were calculated for each question asked across the various surveys. Qualitative responses to open-ended questions were coded to determine the dominant themes emerging, which are presented in this report.

Chi square ($\chi^2$) tests were also conducted to determine whether Pre-Post changes and relevant sub-group differences were statistically significant.

ETHICS
This project was reviewed and approved by Southern Cross University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number: ECN-10-146), as well as being conducted in accordance with the CCYP’s internally-developed Code of Ethical Practice for Working & Researching with Children & Young People.
RESULTS

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS
As detailed in the table below, this report is based on evaluation forms collected from 84 KC groups delivered across 35 schools. The exact number of participants attending each group is unclear but estimated at an average of 25 students per group and one teacher per school class. Based on these estimates, most students (86%, n=1804) completed either a Pre or a Post survey, with both surveys available for almost two-thirds of them (n=1299), and slightly over one-third of teachers (n=33) completed their post-only evaluation forms. Given a very close similarity between the responses of students with and without both Pre and Post surveys completed, the findings presented in this evaluation report will include all students completing the particular survey item(s) being discussed.

As shown in the table below, the vast majority of students participating in this evaluation were from Year 6 or 5/6 classes. Almost half of them attended schools in Interrelate’s Central Coast region, with another one-third coming from the upper and lower Mid-North Coast regions and the remainder split across the Far North Coast, Hunter and Central West regions. Participating teachers were also mostly from the Central and Mid-North Coast regions, although somewhat more evenly spread than the students. About four-fifths of both students and teachers attended public schools and only one teacher had previously attended a KC session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIDS CONNeXIONS: EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KC Groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre – 1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – 1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either – 1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both – 1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIDS CONNeXIONS: SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Year(s) of Class</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrelate Region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Previous KC Attendance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH THE KC PROGRAM**

As shown in the following table, teachers reported extremely high levels of satisfaction with the KC program, with mean ratings of over three points from a possible four on all questions. Almost all teachers agreed that the KC program involved suitable activities and resources, was enjoyable and useful for their students, fulfilled their own expectations and catered for students with varying ability levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIDS CONNEXIONS: TEACHER SATISFACTION (n = 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and visual aids were suited to your students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enjoyed the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program has been useful to your students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program fulfilled your expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration was given to varying ability levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These very positive satisfaction ratings were supported by teachers’ written responses to an open-ended question asking if they had any other comments: 85% of teachers (n=28) offered some positive feedback about the KC program in relation to one or more of the following:

- **66% (n=22)** who complimented the program’s approach, activities and/or resources:
  - A clear positive presentation. Children were allowed to comment so felt comfortable
  - Children responded well to lessons.
  - Excellent behaviour management on a difficult all boy class
  - Good use of children’s interest in Bingo as a reward.
  - Great inclusion of children.
  - Great interaction and involvement.
  - The children seemed to enjoy each session
  - The presentation had enough variation of activities and issues to maintain class interest.
  - Variety of strategies. Booklet was appealing and easy for children to use.
  - Very well delivered - The program was directed to their age level and children were interested and involved in lessons.
  - Very well done. Engaging and professional
  - Well done presentation.

- **55% (n=18)** who particularly praised the Interrelate Educator:
  - <Educator> developed a great rapport with the children
  - <Educator> did a great job. Much better presentation than at previous attendance - varying ability levels make it tough.
  - <Educator> was relaxed and respectful to the children.
  - <Educator> was very inclusive and encouraging, maintaining a positive tone throughout
  - <Educator> was very realistic regarding the students behaviours etc. She engaged and supported students positively.
  - <Educator> was well organised, enthusiastic and competently presented this program.
  - <Educator> was wonderful. She quickly developed a great rapport with the students and this allowed them to discuss issues openly. They trusted her. She really made a difference!
  - <Educator>’s style and delivery is a key factor to the success.
  - All well presented. Friendly demeanor fostered a good relationship with class
  - Calm and ‘in control’ considering class was talkative.
  - Fantastic - professional, warm presenter.
• I was very impressed by her connection with the students.

• **42% (n=14)** who appreciated the overall program and/or the topics covered; and
  - Content correlated well with Y6 PDHPE Unit.
  - Excellent recap on previous week.
  - Excellent, very worthwhile (more than this - essential) content. the content of this program is so vital to pre-teens. Early intervention is so important.
  - Fantastic program, needs to be long term. Strongly ties in with Stage 3 curriculum and focus on relationships.
  - Good coverage for this age level
  - I thought it was a great program!
  - Students responded well - saying "We knew about these things but now we know what it actually takes to make a relationship and it has taken our understanding to a new level".
  - This was an excellent program which was a valuable addition to our current 'You Can Do It' program - Getting Along section
  - Very worthwhile program. Would thoroughly recommend this to other schools. Spot on topics.

• **12% (n=4)** who expressed their thanks and/or congratulations.
  - Thank you, it reinforced things I had been discussing with them.
  - Thanks <Educator>, this was a valuable addition to our welfare program.

In response to the same question, **21% of teachers (n=7)** also raised concerns and/or suggested ways the KC program’s content, approach or resources may be improved:
  - 2 sessions was too short for the program. A shorter session over 3 or 4 weeks would allow for more discussion. I felt it was too rushed, especially session one.
  - It’s just a shame the children did not appreciate the program and it’s outcomes.
  - Powerpoint slides to enhance/ reinforce central messages/ outcomes/ ideas.
  - Socks are for Kinder! far too much info in time available, no down time for any discussion/ reflection.
  - The auction activity was not understood by the majority of students.
  - The workbook and relationship wheel need a redraft (the wheel was incorrectly assembled but that’s an easy fix).
  - There was way too much content to cover on Day 1. Maybe lesson activities could be put onto a powerpoint.

In addition, **33% of teachers (n=11)** offered the following suggestions in response to a second open-ended question asking about any other needs that could have been covered:
  - Bullying and assertiveness, transition to high school and 'change'
  - Bullying and children mentioned to me they would love to hear about boy-girl problems!
  - How groups of students form and their dynamics - 'in' and 'out' students
  - Maybe a leadership theme for Yr 5. Power in relationships
  - Maybe more on dealing with bullying
  - Perhaps a little stronger on the cyberbullying aspect and responsibilities connected with safe internet etc.
  - Saying NO - practice/ role play sessions. 3wks duration - 1hr sessions
  - Sex education
  - Smaller groups to target ‘shared problems’
  - Students of all ages would benefit. Bullying.
  - Yes, would like program to cover puberty.
PERCEIVED STUDENT LEARNINGS

AWARENESS OF WHAT CONSTITUTES A ‘RELATIONSHIP’

The Pre survey asked students the open-ended question: ‘How many relationships do you think you have?’. As shown in the graph below, 16% were unsure but most students nominated having between 1 and 50 relationships (or words interpreted to that effect), with a median of 10-30 relationships.

The Post survey then asked students whether they now felt that they had guessed the right number, too many or not enough relationships. Of the 1428 students answering this question:

- 51% (n=723) felt they had guessed the right amount of relationships;
- 39% (n=552) felt they had guessed too few relationships; and
- 11% (n=153) felt they had guessed too many relationships.

As shown in the graph below, these responses varied in accordance with students’ Pre-program estimates ($\chi^2=68.768$, p<0.000001): students who nominated having 30 or less relationships were more likely to feel they had under-estimated, whereas students who nominated having more than 30 relationships were more likely to feel they had guessed right.

The Post survey also asked students to rate: ‘How much more did you learn about this than you’d thought about beforehand?’. Of the 1446 students answering this question:

- 48% (n=696) felt they had learned ‘a lot more’;
- 46% (n=671) felt they had learned ‘a bit more’; and
- only 5% (n=79) felt they had learned ‘nothing new’.
UNDERSTANDING THEIR OWN RELATIONSHIP SKILLS

Both the Pre and Post surveys asked students to rate the extent to which they brought ‘good and bad stuff’ to their relationships. As shown in the graph below, students were much more likely to perceive they could make more positive contributions to their relationships after participating in the KC program ($\chi^2=78.815, p<0.000001$).

The Pre survey also asked students: ‘How well do you think you know your strengths and weaknesses in relationships?’. Of the 1634 students answering this question:

- 50% (n=824) felt they knew themselves ‘very well’;
- 45% (n=736) felt they knew themselves ‘enough to get by’; and
- only 5% (n=74) felt they ‘didn’t know themselves well enough’.

The Post survey then asked students if they felt they now knew their relationship strengths and weaknesses any better. Of the 1442 students answering this question:

- 52% (n=748) felt they now knew their strengths and weaknesses ‘a lot better’;
- 35% (n=507) felt they now knew them ‘a bit better’;
- 11% (n=160) felt perceived no difference; and
- only 2% (n=27) felt less aware or more confused.

As shown in the graph below, these responses varied considerably in accordance with students’ Pre-program self-awareness levels ($\chi^2=34.269, p<0.00001$): students who reported feeling more self-aware in the Pre survey were more likely to perceive bigger improvements in knowing their relationship strengths and weaknesses.
Understanding Healthy and Unhealthy Relationships

The Pre survey asked students to rate: ‘How much do you know about what makes the difference between good and bad relationships?’ Of the 1646 students answering this question, 90% indicated wanting to know more: 57% of students wanted to know ‘a bit more’ and 33% wanted to know ‘a lot more’.

Both the Pre and Post surveys asked students to rate: ‘How easy is it, do you think, to be able to tell if a relationship is healthy or unhealthy for you?’ As shown in the graph below, students were very much more likely and confident to assess the healthiness of their relationships after participating in the KC program ($\chi^2=537.146, p<0.00001$).
CONFIDENCE TO LEAVE AN UNHEALTHY RELATIONSHIP
The Pre survey asked students: ‘When a relationship becomes uncomfortable, unpleasant, unhealthy or unsafe, how confident are you in saying “No” or walking away?’. Of the 1636 students answering this question:

- 25% (n=415) felt ‘very confident’;
- 51% (n=841) felt ‘confident enough’;
- 19% (n=318) felt ‘not very confident’; and
- only 4% (n=62) felt ‘not at all confident’.

The Post survey then asked students if they now felt any more confident about leaving a bad relationship. Of the 1441 students answering this question:

- 55% (n=792) felt ‘much more confident’;
- 31% (n=449) felt ‘a bit more confident’;
- 12% (n=172) felt ‘not much difference or just the same’; and
- only 2% (n=28) felt ‘less confident or confused’.

As shown in the following graph, these responses varied considerably in accordance with students’ Pre-program confidence levels ($\chi^2=58.717$, $p<0.00001$): students who reported feeling more confident in the Pre survey were more likely to perceive bigger improvements in their confidence to leave a bad relationship.
# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: STUDENT PRE EVALUATION FORM – KC PROGRAM

**Students’ Pre Evaluation**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How many relationships do you think you have?

2. How much do you know about what makes the difference between good and bad relationships?
   - [ ] I wish I knew a lot more
   - [ ] I’d like to know a bit more
   - [ ] I’m happy with what I know already

3. How easy is it, do you think, to be able to tell if a relationship is healthy or unhealthy for you?
   - [ ] easy
   - [ ] equally easy or hard
   - [ ] hard
   - [ ] mostly don’t think about it

4. Would you say you bring to your relationships...
   - [ ] mostly good stuff
   - [ ] more good stuff than bad
   - [ ] equal good and bad stuff
   - [ ] more bad stuff than good
   - [ ] mostly bad stuff

5. How well do you think you know your strengths and weaknesses in relationships?
   - [ ] know myself very well
   - [ ] know myself enough to get by
   - [ ] don’t know myself well enough

6. When a relationship becomes uncomfortable, unpleasant, unhealthy or unsafe, how confident are you in saying “No” or walking away?
   - [ ] very confident
   - [ ] confident enough
   - [ ] not very confident
   - [ ] not at all confident

---

**Thank you: Sooo much for filling in this form!**

**Interrelate Family Centres**

Strengthening Family Relationships...since 1986

[www.interrelate.org.au](http://www.interrelate.org.au)
APPENDIX B: STUDENT POST EVALUATION FORM – KC PROGRAM

Student’s Post Evaluation

Your name..............................................................................................................................................................

Class........................................................................................................................................................................

1. When you guessed how many relationships you have do you now think you...
- guessed too many?
- got it right?
- guessed not enough?

2. How much more did you learn about this than you’d thought about beforehand? I learned -
- a lot more
- a bit more
- nothing new

3. How easy do you think it will now be to tell if a relationship is healthy or unhealthy for you?
- easy
- equally easy or hard
- hard
- mostly don’t think about it

4. What do you think now about your future part in your relationships, would you say you are more likely to bring to these relationships.....
- mostly good stuff
- more good stuff than bad
- equal good and bad stuff
- more bad stuff than good
- mostly bad stuff

5. Thinking now about your strengths and weaknesses in relationships...
   Following the session I know my strengths and weaknesses -
   - a lot better
   - a bit better
   - just about the same/not sure
   - less or confused

6. Say a relationship becomes uncomfortable, unpleasant, unhealthy or unsafe, having completed this session how confident are you in saying "No" or walking away?
- I’m much more confident now
- I’m a bit more confident now
- Not much difference or just the same
- Less confident or confused

Thank you sooo much for filling in this form!
APPENDIX C: TEACHER EVALUATION FORM – KC PROGRAM

Teacher’s Evaluation

School: ..........................................................  
Date: ......................  Trainer: ............................................

Students enjoyed the program  [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
Program fulfilled your expectations  [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
Consideration was given to varying ability levels  [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
Program has been useful to your students  [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
Activities and visual aids were suited to your students  [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree

1  Are there further comments you wish to make about the above, the educator and/or their method of presentation?  

.................................................................................................................................

2  Are there any other needs in your school the program could have covered?  

.................................................................................................................................

3  Have you ever seen this program before?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

4  If Yes, A) How many times .................................................................
   B) How did this compare to previous presentations  
      —with regards to program content: .................................................................
      —with regards to Trainer’s presentation: .................................................................

...and from the Trainer: thank you  
for your help during the program & taking the time to give us this feedback

Please return to Educator  
or post to:  Project Officer - Kids ConneXions  
PO BOX 2349, Dangar NSW 2309

Add any additional regional info here!
### Appendix D: Schools Included in Evaluating the KC Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunter</strong></td>
<td>Charlestown Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congewai Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellalong Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fern Bay Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heaton Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesmond Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marks Point Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millfield Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Coast</strong></td>
<td>Avoca Beach Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brisbania Public School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Point Christian College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karing Public School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisarow Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northlakes Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Clare Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrigal Primary School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Entrance Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuggerah Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuggerawong Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wadalba Community School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodport Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Mid-North Coast</strong></td>
<td>Kempsey South Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Haven Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tacking Point Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westport Public School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Mid-North Coast</strong></td>
<td>Bellingen Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop Druitt College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonville Public School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Help of Christians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Augustine’s Primary School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central West</strong></td>
<td>St John’s Primary School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Central School, Wellington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Far North Coast</strong></td>
<td>Alstonville Public School</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bexhill Public School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bogangar Public School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>