

SPAM - Self and Peer Assessment Model

Mervi Ahola and Meiju Hovi, Finland

EGL, Brussels 5.6.2019

Agenda

- ▶ What and why
 - ▶ A few word about the background
 - ▶ Idea and logic of criteria
- ▶ How to use it
 - ▶ Self-assessment
 - ▶ Peer auditing
 - ▶ In addition: introduction, planning etc.
- ▶ Testing the criteria
- ▶ Questions, discussion

Background of SPAM

- ▶ Idea of the model comes from UK (ofsted= Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills)
- ▶ In Finland, the assessment model of youth work emphasizes self-learning in the activities and at the sites and peer auditing in developing the work instead of external audits
- ▶ The criteria in kind of list for what we see important in these activities
- ▶ The assessment model has been developed in collaboration with youth workers
- ▶ Used in various parts of Finland, at least 25 biggest cities use the model
- ▶ The criteria are updated regularly and based on the experiences obtained

WHY

- ▶ Historically in Finnish youth work we have focused on indicators which give information about figures: how many youngsters participate in activities etc.
 - There was a need for a tool for assessing the quality of youth work
- ▶ In focus of the model there is the quality of youth work practices and pedagogical issues
- ▶ SPAM has been developed specially to youth work, it is very customized tool
- ▶ SPAM helps identify the strengths and areas of development of the activities
- ▶ Youth workers find the criteria an easy way to understand what types of components good work is made up of
- ▶ With the criteria and levels, a shared meaning and understanding is created for the content of high-quality activities

Idea of SPAM

- ▶ Idea is to use list of certain criterion for different methods/activity of youth work
 - ▶ Open door activities
 - ▶ Small group activities
 - ▶ Camp activities
 - ▶ YIC
- ▶ Each criterion has four assessment levels
 - ▶ Excellent (4), good (3), satisfactory (2), poor/insufficient (1)
- ▶ In each level has explanations of what is required to reach that level
- ▶ Some of the levels are normative, such as safety
- ▶ Good activities or policies mentioned for a lower level are included in the higher level but not separately mentioned
- ▶ At the excellent level, the actions are common to the entire work community or pair; an individual employee who works excellently cannot reach the excellent level

Criterion 5: Active interaction

4 EXCELLENT	3 GOOD	2 SATISFACTORY	1 POOR
<p>The instructors take initiative in their actions and consider all youths in the space. The instructors support the dialogue among the youths and challenge the youths to interact with one another. The instructors and the youths express trust for one another in their interactions.</p>	<p>The instructors participate with the youths in the activities and build interaction situations. The interaction between the instructors and the youths is natural.</p>	<p>The authority of the instructors is emphasised in the interaction situations. The dialogues are primarily initiated by the youths.</p>	<p>The instructors are passive and mostly intervene in case of problems. The interaction is limited to maintaining order.</p>

How to use SPAM: self-assessment

1. Self-assessment

- ▶ Done by work community, e.g. team of youth centre
- ▶ Phases of assessment:
 1. Individual assessment
 2. Share individual assessments
 - ▶ Make consensus via discussion / dialogue
 - ▶ Respect different point of views
 - ▶ Give space and time for each and everyone
 3. Choose the things you want to develop

How to use SPAM: peer auditing

- ▶ Is done by other youth workers
- ▶ Is always done in pairs so that the assessment is always based on the observations of the same event by at least two people.
- ▶ The auditor pairs are formed so that auditors come from different youth centres or from a neighbouring municipality, for instance.
- ▶ Important part of auditing is feedback. both written and face to face
- ▶ Auditors are not consult who give recommendations
 - ▶ they give their observation to the team
 - ▶ Team decides how to use the feedback
- ▶ Also auditors can learn from the work of colleagues
 - Good ideas and practices (and learning from the not-so-good ones...)

Testing the criteria

- ▶ Choose activity you want to use in testing SPAM
- ▶ Choose approx. 5 criterion and assess choosen activity using these criterion
- ▶ Some rules:
 - ▶ Assess acts/achievements, not goals
 - ▶ Assess activity, not personality of youth workers
 - ▶ Youth workers personals skills or tendencies are not assessed, we assess our professional way of doing / expressing youth work

Questions for common discussion

- ▶ Feedback and comments about SPAM
- ▶ What kind of assessment tools and/or quality development models you use in your work?
- ▶ In the Charter: the quality development of local youth work needs:
 - ▶ a clear and comprehensive system for documentation and follow up of outcomes, preconditions and work processes in relation to measurable indicators and aims;
 - ▶ regular and up to date mappings of local realities and needs;
 - ▶ clear procedures for continuous analysis of and reflection on outcomes in terms of how they relate to preconditions, work processes and activities, and the need for further development;
 - ▶ clear procedures for continuous updates on new national and international research, trends and methods in the field of youth and youth work;
 - ▶ common efforts of all stakeholders to cooperate around quality development and adoption of innovations;
 - ▶ continuous competence development of youth workers based on a clear competency framework in
- ▶ Do tools and models support (enough) the idea of Charters statements of youth work quality?

In addition SPAM can be used

1. Make the work visible
 - Describing the activities and, consequently, youth work helps justify the significance and impact of youth work
2. Outline and focus the discussion on the content of the work; create a mutual understanding and an agreement on the significance of high-quality activities
3. Provide orientation to new workers
4. Plan work content and select areas of focus
5. Develop assessment expertise and skills for providing feedback

Thank You!

mervi.ahola@vaasa.fi
merja.hovi@hel.fi