



INV Training itinerary

Use of the Self-Observation Protocol Reporting format – ITALIAN group

FREQUENCY

Has the Protocol been filled regularly? How frequently?

According to the previous Italian trainer reports, 23 professionals have filled in, signed and give back to AIPD the testing protocol, but finally only **22** professionals have participated in the testing.

As shown by the table below (Table 1), which resume the testing monitoring until the 30th of September (testing deadline), the decreasing of the protocols received has grown up. This is a foreseeable fact because of the interruption of the summer period in addition to the workload already highlighted by professionals. This feature has still influenced negatively the commitment of the professionals.

So far at the end of the testing 148 protocols have been delivered by the Italian group of professionals involved.

During the testing period protocols has not been filled regularly. Only 3 professionals have filled in the protocol from the beginning to the end of the testing on regular basis (twice a month, except holidays period). The most part of participants have delivered protocols only when they had time or when meaningful event has occurred.

Table 1. TESTING MONITORING until 30th of September 2014 – ITALIAN GROUP

NAME	SURNAME	31/03	14/04	28/04	12/05	26/05	09/06	23/06	07/07	21/07	11/08	08/09	22/09	TOT
1. DANIELA	INFANTE	1			1	1	1	1						5
2. DANIELE	FICO	4	2		1	2								9
3. DANIELE	PAVENTI	2	1		1									4
4. DARIO	GERMINARIO	2	1	1		1	1							6
5. DORIANA	PAGLIALUNGA	2	2		1	1	1		2					9
6. ELISA	MANTOVANI	2	2	2	2									8
7. IRENE	VOLPI	2		1										3
8. LINDA	GEMMATI	2	1	2		2	1	1					1	10
9. MARA	MAZZOTTI	1	1		2									4
10. MARIA CARMELA	DEL POMO	1				1								2
11. MARIA CARMINE	OMBRATO	2	1		1	1								5
12. MARIA GIOVANNA	SCHIRONE	2	2											4
13. MARIA TERESA	MORELLO	2	1		1									4
14. MONICA	LUNARDI	2	2											4
15. PAOLA	BAGGI	2	1		2	1								6
16. RAFFAELLA	TRAMONTOZZI	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	22
17. ROSSELLA CASANOVA	BORCA	2	1		1	2	1							7
18. SABRINA	DI MARCO											2	3	5
19. SALVATORE	GRAZIANO	2	1											3
20. SARA	METELLI	1			1		1	1		2		1	3	10
21. VALERIA	ACERRA	2	2		1	1								6
22. VERONICA	MARGIOTTA CASALUCI	2	2	2	1	1	1		1	1		1		12
TOT		40	25	10	18	16	9	5	5	5	2	5	8	148

ACCURACY

Has the Protocol been filled in with accuracy (recording, analysis of own feelings and theoretical reference points in the evaluation)?

This report refers to the last 24 protocols, more in details 9 of them have been filled in with the original version of the protocol and 15 with the new version (tested by 4 professionals).

This is to say that it is not a relevant sample in order to verify the accuracy and to give further information about the testing.

Regarding the protocols filled in with the *original format*, they still have been completed carefully and show the commitment of the professionals in “stressing” a deeply reflection on the relation. The theory of the Model seems to be closer to the practice than in the past report.

Regarding the protocols filled in with the *new format*, they show a commitment from professionals who have not participated in the previous period of the testing. Probably an easy and fast format of the protocol has more chance to be completed when the event occurs because it takes few time to be filled in.

The *new format* foresees two document:

- one is for the registration of moments of emotional intensity, to be completed as soon as possible after a moment considered of special emotional intensity in the framework of the pedagogical relationship between the professional and the person with severe intellectual disability. In the first question the professional is asked to try to describe briefly what happened, in the rest of the questions is asked to choose what happened and what he/she has felt.
- The other document is for a deeper analysis of the emotions/feelings identified in the pedagogical relationship, starting from all the registrations collected which will draw the specific coping strategy of the professional.

AIPD has received 13 registrations but only 2 analysis. From the protocols delivered it is clear that the registration cannot be separated to the subsequent analysis, because the registration allows to remember the event and the feelings linked with it, but at the same time it doesn't give any idea of a deeper analysis of the behavior usually performed by the professional.

Were there any differences in the accuracy with time passing?

With time passing participants have still showed greater accuracy in compiling protocols, critical points are related only to the expression of the emotions and in explaining the theoretical reference points.

EVENTS RECORDED

What type of events were reported in the Protocol?

The events reported cover a wide range of situations. All of them are about situations that occur both in informal and formal learning situations.

RESULTS

Is it possible to deduce from the protocols an effort to focus on the educational relationship?

According to the new protocols delivered and in line with the previous report it is possible to deduce a stronger effort to focus on the educational relationship.

Do you see a critical reflection regarding the vision of the professionals about the person, with his/her abilities, resources and needs?

As already shown by the last report, professionals are oriented to a more detailed analysis of the event, taking into account abilities, resources and needs of the person with Ds.

Do the items related to the routine challenged?

In some cases it is possible to see that professionals are getting more accurate in analyzing their intervention: routine or a new way of coping?

Can you say that as a whole the Pedagogical model has been comprehended?

The approach of the professionals to the model and the elaboration of the content take into account the emotional sphere.

Some professionals use technical jargon proposed by the model.

In order to transmit the theory of the model is important to an adequate training and a certain period of experience in the field.

STAFF MEETINGS

Which types of event have been declared as important to discuss during staff meetings?

What follows are the most common arguments discussed in the staff meetings:

- Telling of the event
- Reaction and emotions (positive and negative) of the professional
- Reaction and emotions of the person with disability
- Possible interventions and strategies suggested by other staff members
- Analysis and comprehension of the “interrupted gesture”.