

Pilot R5

ECD Quality Toolkit Pilot Project 2016

Resource 5: Mediator Reporting & Reflection Template

Purpose: The purpose of this template is for you to capture your views and impressions about the site visit process and the resources immediately after each site visit. This is for your personal use to support your reporting, but it will be handed in to us at the Mediator Feedback workshop.

You will still receive a template to help you write an overall report to submit electronically within 5 days of the site visit. You will report against the following four categories:

- **Feasibility (that is, what is practical and achievable)**
- **Usefulness of process**
- **Usefulness of resources**
- **Content accuracy, relevance & scope.**

We would also be interested in your personal reflection on quality. Note that you may have different views on how the process and the resources worked at different types of sites, if you visit more than one site.

Site name	
Site type (use key at end of template)	
Brief description of site	

FEASIBILITY	COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Was the process feasible in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time allocated • Approach 	
What are your recommendations on the feasibility of the process?	

USEFULNESS: PROCESS	COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
In your opinion, was the process useful for practitioners in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to notions of quality • Introduction to the process 	

<p>of self-reflection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation for using the Quality Tool going forward 	
<p>What are your recommendations on the usefulness of the process?</p>	

USEFULNESS: RESOURCES	COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>In your opinion, were the resources appropriate for achieving the pilot goals?</p>	
<p>Site Visit Guidelines</p>	
<p>R1: Overview</p>	
<p>R3a: Mediator Prompt Resource</p>	
<p>R3b: Quality Conversation Template & Record</p>	
<p>R4: Observation checklist</p>	
<p>R5: Mediator Reporting & Reflection Template</p>	

CONTENT ACCURACY & RELEVANCE	COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Do you think this process and the supporting resources gave you accurate information about practitioner views and understandings of quality?</p>	
<p>In your opinion, was there a broad match between what you observed at the site and the practitioners' own views?</p>	
<p>What are your</p>	

<p>recommendations on the accuracy, relevance and scope of the Quality Toolkit (process and resources)?</p>	
---	--

PERSONAL REFLECTION	COMMENT
<p>Did you personally learn anything more about quality in ECD through this process?</p> <p>How did the process of site visits match the expectations you identified during the mediator training workshop?</p>	

Thank you for your contribution towards the successful rollout of the pilot project.

KEY FOR RECORDING SITE TYPES

Note: You will use more than one key, as registered/unregistered and well-resourced/ poorly resourced will go with other descriptive categories. Example: BHI = peri urban, poorly resourced, registered.

A	URBAN (Within a city or town; could include urban townships such as Soweto and informal settlements)
B	PERI URBAN (Area around but not in a formally recognised town: plots e.g. Walkerville or Hamaanskraal. Includes townships and informal settlements)
C	RURAL (Sparsely populated areas outside towns in which people farm or depend on natural resources, including villages, townships and informal settlements)
D	COMMUNITY BASED (Designated space or structure for ECD usually organised from within the community)
E	CENTRE/SCHOOL BASED (Formal institutions e.g. nursery schools, creches, either in their own institutions or as part of schools)
F	HOME BASED (ECD provision in a home or structure attached to home for small groups. Includes day mothers and child minders)
G	WELL RESOURCED
H	POORLY RESOURCED
I	REGISTERED
J	UNREGISTERED