

A. Background

During the months of April and May 2006 Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth undertook five consultations structured to include morning and afternoon sessions. One session was facilitated with divisional teams including representatives from independent schools¹ while the second session was facilitated with students.

Proactive Information Services Inc. was retained to facilitate these sessions as they have a wealth of experience in education-related projects. Since 1984 Proactive has worked in the education sector at the local, provincial, national and international levels.²

Information resulting from the consultations was to be utilized in outlining a framework “for the development of S3 and S4 PE/HE curriculum in Manitoba Schools.” Specifically, the consultations are to aid in determining:

- ✦ What should the PE/HE curriculum look like?
- ✦ What delivery options will work?
- ✦ Given current resources and best practices, what will work best for Manitoba schools and students?

B. Summary

1. Divisional Teams

- ✦ Thirty-one school/divisional teams were likely to use “**Option 2 – In and Out of School**” as their delivery model. Many of the participants mentioned in discussion their preference for “Option 1 – In School”; however, their current financial, facility and staffing realities are viewed as mitigating against the likelihood of this model being used.

¹ - The consultations took place in Brandon (April 25), Thompson (May 4), Cranberry Portage (May 5), with two in Winnipeg (May 8 and 9).

² - Proactive Information Services Inc. was established in 1984 specifically to provide research and evaluation services to clients in the public and non-profit sectors. Proactive’s clients include ministries of education, other government departments, foundations, and other NGO’s across Canada, as well as in Europe and Argentina. For more information on Proactive, visit www.proactive.mb.ca.

- ✦ The **development model** most often chosen was **“Mix and Match Modules.”**
- ✦ **“Print Courses for In School”** was the most frequently identified design format.
- ✦ **Challenges** most often associated with the implementation of this model included; developing a process for **assessment/accountability**, **safety/liability issues**, the allocation of **staff/teaching time**, and **financial constraints**.

2. Student Teams

- ✦ Students reinforced many issues and concerns raised by the divisional teams. Overall, students found **“Option 2 – In and Out of School”** as the model that was most appealing.
- ✦ If “Option 2 – In and Out of School” is the delivery model developed, student input highlighted the need to establish a balance between offering **flexible programming/options** and ensuring students receive requisite **support and supervision**.



C. The Consultation Process

School divisions were invited to bring four members of their divisional team including; an administrator, a physical education teacher, a health education teacher as well as divisional consultants if appropriate. Students were chosen by the schools for participation in the student sessions. In total 37 school/division³ teams had representatives at the sessions (Table 1).

Sites	Adults	School/Divisional Teams	Students
Brandon	36	11	18
Thompson	4	2	25
Cranberry Portage	8	3	33
Winnipeg – South	37	12	32
Winnipeg – Centre	26	9	28
Total	111	37	136

1. Divisional Teams

A brief presentation to participants set the context in which the decision was made to develop Senior 3 and Senior 4 physical education/health education curricula. Representatives from Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth then took participants through a Discussion Tool which outlined three optional delivery models – “Option 1 - In School”, “Option 2 - In and Out of School”, and “Option 3 - Out of School”. Participants were also asked to identify other delivery options that came to mind.

After the presentation, individuals participating in the consultation process as members of school/divisional teams were mixed into small groups according to their position. They were asked to identify what they viewed as each option’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges (SWOC). Upon

³ - A list of schools/divisions attending is found in the appendix.

completion of this task they presented to the larger group and were then requested to return to their school/divisional team.

Each school/divisional team was then requested to identify the option(s) they were most likely to use, as well as their desired development model and design format. They were also requested to identify challenges they perceived as being associated with their chosen delivery model(s).

2. Student Teams

Students were also taken through a brief introduction process which included setting the context for the consultations and the three options outlined in the Discussion Tool. After the introduction, students were asked to participate in a number of activities. Through individual and small group activities students identified the perceived advantages and disadvantages associated with each option. Students were then split into other groups and asked to create 'Mind Maps' of their chosen option.

D. The Consultations – Resulting Information

1. School/Divisional Teams

Overall, participants were most positive about **“Option 2 – In and Out of School”**. However it was voiced in the Brandon⁴ session and reinforced a number of times thereafter that for many participants, **“Option 1 – In School”** was their preferred choice of delivery model. Nevertheless, given financial, facility and staffing realities, it was argued that it is not possible for many schools to implement “Option 1 – In School”. Therefore, “Option 2 – In and Out of School” was the model schools/divisions identified as being most likely to implement.

a. Small Groups – SWOC

Option 1 – In School

Strengths/Opportunities – The most frequently identified strengths of this model is that it provides for consistent standards and quality control/accountability. In addition, this model will ensure that Senior 3 and Senior

⁴ - An overview of each session is provided in the appendix.

4 PE/HE are directed by teachers – “*trained professionals*”. Partnerships and the use of outside facilities were viewed as opportunities to be pursued if this model were developed⁵.

Weaknesses/Challenges – Given their current realities the small groups identified many weaknesses with this delivery model. The most frequently identified weaknesses included the timetable challenges which might necessitate the dropping of other courses. Additionally, the lack of trained staff, financial constraints and the lack of facilities and equipment were also viewed as a weakness/challenge of this model. In addition, fear was expressed that graduation rates will decline due to students who cannot or will not participate.

Option 2 – In and Out of School

Strengths/Opportunities – This option was viewed as allowing for the flexibility needed to meet the students’, schools’ and community’s needs. This model was also seen as being focused on wellness and healthy lifestyle issues. Partnerships and the different/new modules that might result from this model were identified as opportunities.



Weaknesses/Challenges – The perceived lack of quality assurance was the most frequently expressed concern regarding this model. However, staffing constraints, timetabling, as well as issues related to equity and safety/liability were also raised a number of times.


Option 3 – Out of School

Strengths/Opportunities – The flexibility provided to students was most often viewed as a strength of this model. Again the potential for partnerships as well as students being able to pursue their own interests were opportunities this model might provide.

⁵ - The detailed tables in the appendix present all results.

Weaknesses/Challenges – The lack of accountability/quality control, staffing and financial constraints, as well as safety/liability concerns were most often identified as weaknesses of this model. Furthermore, concerns were expressed regarding funding and issues related to equity.

Schematic of S3 & S4 Curricula (SWOC) Small Groups – Most Frequent Mentions



b. School/Divisional Teams

Preferred Option – “Option 2 – In and Out of School” was the delivery model 31 participating teams indicated they would likely use (Table 2).

Nine teams indicated they would use a combination of Option 1 and Option 2.

Option	Yes – Likely to Use	No – Not Likely to Use
In School	13	18
In and Out of School	→ 31	2
Out of School	3	15

During the consultations many participants indicated while Option 2 was the delivery model they were likely to use, they did prefer Option 1.

When teams considered their current realities; the perceived need for financial support, facilities and staffing, Option 1 was not viewed as being a realistic option.

Preferred Development Model and Design Format - Teams most likely to use “Option 2 – In and Out of School” most frequently preferred a development model consisting of **“mix and match modules.”** This option was also the preferred model for teams choosing “Option 1 – In School”.

Furthermore, those choosing “Option 2 – In and Out of School” and/or “Option 1 – In School” most often favoured **“print courses for in-school”** as the design format (Table 3).

Delivery Model	Reason	Development Model	Design Format	Challenge
Option 2 In and Out of School	Flexibility, Uses community facilities	Mix and Match Modules	Print Courses for In School	Assessment/Accountability, Safety/Liability, Staff/Teaching Time, Finances
Option 1 In School	Accountability, Teacher mediated, structured	Mix and Match Modules	Print Courses for In School	Timetabling, Staff/Teaching time, Finances

E. Information Resulting From Student Consultations

Overall, students expressed most support for “**Option 2 - In and Out of School**” delivery model. Student input identified the need for a model which is balanced between offering flexible programming/options and ensuring students receive requisite support and supervision.⁶

The following provides an overview of the most frequently identified advantages and disadvantages and selected quotes.

1. Advantage and Disadvantages of Each Option

Option 1 – In School - Advantages

- ✚ **Structure/Organized**

“It is during school at a specific time of the day and you would be taught what to do and encouraged by the teacher.”

- ✚ **Teacher Led/Guided**

“You can’t get off track easily. It will be supervised so it won’t be slack. You will get active because your teacher will be there to make sure that you’re participating.”

- ✚ **Equity**

“[The] school provides help; there is not cost to me.”

- ✚ **Convenience**

“It is built into your day; you won’t waste time doing it out of school.”

Option 1 – In School – Disadvantages

- ✚ **The Lack of Choice**

“You don’t get to do the activities you want to do.”

- ✚ **Timetabling Issues**

“There may not be enough room in the schedule and therefore a different course may have to be dropped.”

- ✚ **Privacy/Clothing Issues**

“Students might not have a change of gym clothes.”

“Won’t get any privacy.”

⁶ - Transcribed students’ post-its grouped by option and consultation site are found in the appendix.

Option 2 – In and Out of School – Advantages

✦ Increased Choice

“You get a bit of freedom and have many options.”

✦ Increased Flexibility

“Experience in and out of school, more opportunity for learning new skills.”

✦ Fosters Independence/Motivation

“Targets students who will not initiate a program of fitness by themselves while allowing students who are willing to initiate a program to learn how to take ownership of their own well-being.”

✦ Eases Student’s Insecurities

“It is just better for people who aren’t comfortable with themselves. They can do it on their own time.”

Option 2 – In and Out of School – Disadvantages

✦ Equity

“People may not be able to afford the out of school portion.”

✦ Access

“Some people may not have enough money or are not physically capable of doing in or out of school.”

✦ Lack of Student Accountability/Motivation

“Laziness for out because kids don’t have supervision and could slack off.”

✦ Time-management issues

“It will be difficult and scheduling might be time consuming.”


✦ Injuries

“What if you get hurt when you are out of school being active ... who will help you then?”

Option 3 – Advantages

✦ Flexibility - Timetabling/Activity choice

“No worries – freedom from being told what to do and how to do it. You can be active in your own way other than being told what to do – free from being watched and free from being shy.”



✦ Fosters Independence

"More independent to choose what you want to do."

Option 3 – Out of School – Disadvantages

✦ Lack of Teacher Support

"No one to really give you direction and support you."

✦ Lack of Motivation

"Not enough self-responsibility to do exercise outside of school."

✦ Lack of Accountability/Trust

"Students may lie about doing certain activities."

✦ Lack of Time/Time Consuming

"I don't have a lot of time out of school to do much between school, work and homework and all my other activities."

2. The Mind Maps

As previously mentioned, the vast majority of students expressed support for the in and out of school delivery model for S3 and S4 physical education. In order to elicit additional student insights a mind mapping activity was facilitated to encourage the exchange and organization of ideas.

Specifically, students identified the following aspects of **"Option 2 - In and Out of School"** model as most attractive:



- ✦ flexibility in terms of programming and timetables;
- ✦ accommodation of individual interests;
- ✦ building of community/school partnerships;
- ✦ building of school/family partnerships; and,
- ✦ it would require and cultivate student initiative and responsibility.

While students readily conveyed enthusiasm at the thought of being provided more choice and control over their physical education program, many simultaneously expressed need and desire for a substantial degree of teacher-support. Students perceived the role of teachers to be relatively unchanged in terms of initial instruction on methods and techniques, monitoring, and assessment. Students further suggested numerous assessment methods for ensuring student accountability during out-of-school activities including:

- log sheets signed by external supervisor;
- regular student-teacher meetings to monitor progress;
- journal/personal activity log; and,
- student presentations at the end of the semester.

A number of concerns were raised by students surrounding the accessibility of out-of-school activities such as:

- transportation;
- affordability of community facilities;
- access to community facilities; and
- availability of childcare.

As one student expressed, *“some people may not have enough money or are not physically capable of doing in or out of school.”*



Student comments with respect to this delivery model echoed many of the advantages and concerns raised during the divisional team consultations. Student input reinforces the need to establish a balance between offering flexible programming/options and ensuring students receive requisite support and supervision.