

Minnesota Sexuality Education Resource Review Panel

Summary of Panel Review

Review Date: March 2007

Me, My World, My Future (1998)

Curriculum

Target Audience: Junior High

Cost: \$295.00

Distributor: Teen-Aid, Inc.

723 E. Jackson, Spokane, WA 99207 • 509-482-2868 • www.teen-aid.org

The Minnesota Sexuality Education Resource Review Panel **Does Not Recommend** use of this curriculum for the following reasons:

Review Summary:

Me, My World, My Future is comprised of 18 lessons “to be taught as a directive Family Life Education curriculum.” (Teen-Aid, Inc., 1998). This curriculum meets the Federal Section 510, A-H Abstinence Guidelines and like the guidelines, this curriculum is not science-based and contains many inaccuracies and outdated information. In addition to antiquated terminology and false information, the messages in this curriculum are sex negative and confusing. In fact, although there is a focus on abstinence-until-marriage, even that message is unclear, unrealistic, and not consistently and convincingly stated.

The limited curriculum activities do not focus on skill development. The format of the curriculum is difficult to follow and would be very challenging to use with limited preparation time. Materials in the curriculum are graphically not pleasing and in general, the product is outdated and unappealing.

Overall, the panel **does not recommend** the *Me, My World, My Future* curriculum. Panel members conclude that the *Me, My World, My Future* curriculum should not be used as a sexual health education curriculum for any audience and does not meet the minimum standards for recommendation.

Me, My World, My Future (1998)

Assessment Criteria	Mean Score	Comments
Accuracy of Information - Provides basic, accurate information about teen sexual health, e.g., risks of teen sexual activity, ways to avoid intercourse or use methods of protection against pregnancy and STDs, human growth and development, relationships, etc.	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outdated ,contradictory and inaccurate information (e.g. citations from 1964). Note: This comment was repeated by the majority of panel members. ▪ Too much opinion and not factual.
Focus - Focuses on ways to promote sexual health e.g., reducing one or more sexual behaviors that lead to unintended pregnancy or HIV/STD infection; understanding healthy physical/emotional development; developing healthy relationships, etc.	1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on abstinence until marriage ▪ Had some information on relationships and decision-making
Messages - Delivers and consistently reinforces a clear message, e.g., states message multiple times in multiple ways.	1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confusing messages about abstinence. ▪ Disrespectful messages to those not practicing abstinence.
Addresses Social Pressures - Includes activities that address social pressures that influence sexual behavior.	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very limited discussion on social pressures– very few activities of any kind. ▪ Liked the decision-making model.
Communication Skills - Provides examples of and practice with being assertive, using negotiation and refusal skills, making decisions, etc.	1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Liked the “parent grams” that encourage communication. ▪ Activities not focused on skills.
Teaching Methods - Employs a variety of teaching methods designed to involve participants and have them personalize the information.	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lecture format. Like reading a book – no structure for lessons. ▪ Few activities including mime and collage making.
Appropriateness for Audience - Incorporates behavioral goals, teaching methods, and materials that are appropriate to the age, sexual experience, and culture of the students (as stated by publisher.)	1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not recommended for any audience.
Multicultural Perspective - This resource is most appropriate for the following audiences.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No representation of racial or cultural difference. ▪ Assumes everyone is straight and has two parents. ▪ Discriminating against GLBT youth and persons with disabilities (e.g. pg. 17 “how can someone with physical or mental challenges accomplish a great deal of good?”)
Teacher-Friendly - Is well organized with clear, thorough instructions or discussion guide. Minimal assembly or preparation time required.	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confusing, unorganized and poorly written. ▪ Hard to follow and use.
Facilitation Skills Required - How knowledgeable and skilled must the facilitator be to use this resource effectively?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not recommended for any facilitator.
Presentation Quality - How appealing is the product (e.g. visual quality, sound quality, graphics, etc.)?	1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Out of date. ▪ Formatting and graphics unappealing. ▪ Lengthy and difficult to read.
Overall Recommendation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommend Highly - 0 ▪ Recommend - 0 ▪ Reject - 17