

External Evaluation Liaison Group

Job Shadowing Reflective Session

Evaluation Form:

**Name:**

The aim of the job shadowing is to enable the early years practitioners from the partner settings to work together, learn from each other and reflect upon how they support toddlers’ wellbeing and the different strategies they are using and developing through:

* Job shadowing in a setting partners setting and observing each other’s practice to gain a better understanding of the role of the early years practitioner in relation to their educational system, curriculum and provision;
* To gain a better knowledge and understanding of how the setting partners are supporting toddlers’ wellbeing through the different intellectual outputs and materials:
  + Toddlers’ wellbeing,
  + Toddlers’ voices and expressions,
  + Toddlers’ mealtimes and
  + Toddlers’ early language(s)
* To reflect, contrast and compare the ways of working and strategies developed to support toddlers’ wellbeing.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | Performance Indicator | Themes | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **1** | **Quality of the job shadowing experience**  1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3satisfactory and 4= poor | |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | The job shadowing experience of the setting partners | * The extent to which each partner contributes to the job shadowing * The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the job shadowing |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | Links between the aims of the job shadowing experience and the overall aims of the ToWe project | * Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and job shadowing experience rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the job shadowing experience * Clear evidence in the job shadowing experience programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | Development of positive attitudes of collaborative working | * Opportunities for the development of positive attitudes towards the job shadowing experience * The extent and quality of the job shadowing experience * The extent of opportunities for participants to share information about their own countries and education systems |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | Performance Indicator | **Themes** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **2** | **Structure, content and experience of job shadowing**  1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3satisfactory and 4= poor | |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Organisation of the job shadowing experience | * Evidence of clear planning * Realistic timescales * Appropriateness of the programme |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities within the job shadowing experience | * Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the job shadowing * Relevant mixture of activities e.g. job shadowing in setting, reflective session, discussion on educational system and curriculum, social activities, free time * Appropriateness of the social programme |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 | Effectiveness of the job shadowing and other activities etc. | * appropriate subject competence and knowledge * good communicators with the necessary language skills |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 | Effectiveness of shared ownership of the job shadowing | * Evidence that the needs and expectations of participants have been taken into account * Evidence that participants have the opportunity to contribute their own expertise |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5 | Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation | * Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term including follow-up activities, if appropriate * Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Performance Indicator** | **Themes** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **3** | **Reflective Session**  1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3satisfactory and 4= poor | |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | Quality and appropriateness of the reflective session in enabling participants to reflect and sharing their learning and experience | * Opportunities for reflection * Quality of reflective discussions * Participation * Comparing and contrasting between own and hosting country’s provision and practice in supporting toddlers’ wellbeing |  |  |  |  |

**Example:**

‘**Quality of the job shadowing experience**’ (1.1)

This performance indicator is concerned with:

* *The extent to which each partner contributes to the experience*
* *The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the experience*

**A performance meriting Level 1 would be illustrated by:**

1. Each partner plays a role in the experience according to an agreed prior division of roles and responsibilities
2. There is clear evidence of a collaborative approach with strong team work

**A performance meriting Level 4 would be illustrated by:**

1. There is a lack of clarity in the partners’ division of roles and responsibilities and consequently there may be evidence of a failure to contribute as required
2. Where problems have arisen, there is a lack of commitment to finding a mutually acceptable compromise