



INV Training itinerary

Use of the Self-Observation Protocol

FCSD

Frequency

Since the last report (May 2014) one professional has decided to leave the testing. That means we've had one more drop-out and leaves us with 12 participants.

Continuing the trend set after Easter holidays, the volume of received protocols since the deadline of 15 may 2014 has been rather low. Although we got some protocols with delay and it seemed we were going to return to a higher level of participation, the number of received questionnaires has become fewer with time. Remarkable is that some people that hadn't sent protocols for some weeks started to send them again. And others that had been participating very actively before stopped sending us their protocols.

The comeback of people that were temporarily inactive could be related to a motivating e-mail we sent everybody informing about the end of the testing period and inviting them to make a last effort. On the other hand, the lower participation of previously active people can be, partly, explained by the fact that some of the users of the services left early on summer holidays, leaving the professionals without interaction possibilities with the person they had chosen. Another reason could be a decreasing motivation of the professionals (some of them have expressed it with this words) or the lack of time due to the higher volume of work in the last months before the summer break.

The number of received protocols, according to the deadlines, is shown in next table:

Deadline	28/03/14	14/04/14	28/04/14	12/05/14	26/05/14	09/06/14	23/06/14	30/06/14
Nr.of protocols	17	20	9	10	10	8	7	5

Accuracy

The accuracy with which the protocols have been completed hasn't changed very much since the last report, although some of the participants have filled them in even more briefly than they did before.

The way a part of the protocols have been completed, gives us the feeling that some people made a last effort in relation to the self-reflection but weren't really motivated for it.

We also notice that most of the participants continue having difficulties in finding theoretical reference points for the evaluation and in giving an answer to the questions 4 and 5.

Events recorded

The recorded events continue being different kinds of situations, those with negative or difficult elements (inactivity or lack of response of the person with disability, negative reactions to proposals made by the professional...), and those with a more positive, happy or successful elements (positive unexpected reactions of the person with id, new achievements of the person ...).

As in the last report, the events recorded are about situations that occur in a context of daily life and "informal" learning routines or in "formal" learning situations.

Results

We don't see much change in the way the professionals reflect about the situations they propose.

They still seem to have difficulties to analyze their emotions, to relate to similar situations and the emotions involved and to evaluate their own ways of acting/handling situations.

At the same time, they still don't make deeper reflections and don't make any reference to the model.

Nevertheless we do see a critical reflection regarding the vision they have, as professionals, about the person they're working with and a willingness to try to understand the situation of the other and to put themselves in the shoes of the other when he/she doesn't react as they would expect from him/her.

In general, the following reflection can be made:

The received protocols confirm very clearly that the pedagogical relationship brings out emotions and feelings, probably in the two subjects of the relationship, even though the project focuses on the educators.

They also confirm that these emotions influence the educational and personal response, often overlapping the criteria of the educational methodology agreed by the professional or the team.

We detect a lack of habit in the identification and analysis of this emotional factor in the pedagogical relationship, although its effects are clear and meaningful:

- *Alterations of the methodological premises.*
- *Individualization (not voluntary) of the educational response.*
- *Fragility of the professional certainties that causes doubts about the method and the individual professional performance.*

Initially, educators don't give pedagogical importance to their emotions, and they even avoid thinking about the personal relationship with the person with disabilities, so, when these issues arise, a certain anxiety comes up as well as a need for guidance on how to handle them.

Some attitudes that, we think, have appeared during the project, should be object of intervention:

- *Difficulty in assimilating, also at an emotional level, that all the processes of personal growth, learning and change, imply different movements forward and backward.*
- *Excessive clinging on to theoretical assumptions of the pedagogical relationship (the fact of teaching) especially when this helps to undervalue the personal- emotional relation.*
- *Excessive weight of 'uniform' decisions of the team, leaving no room for any individualized personal expression of the educators (depersonalization of the educational fact)*
- *Lack of resources in the management of conflicts, especially of violent behavior.*

The project also demonstrates the need to promote support structures for the educators so that they can identify and understand their emotional reactions, without feeling guilt or a decrease of their professional self-esteem.

This can go from self-reflection tools (like the protocol) to guidelines for the discussion in teams or psychological supervision.

In any case, we must take into account the fact that these professionals, currently, lack time for these reflection and preparation tasks.

Finally, it should be noted that the principles and guidelines of the Pedagogical Model may require a reformulation in order to become a bit easier to apply when doing the self-observation. We have the feeling they haven't been really useful to the participants in the process of elaborating their feelings in the protocols.

Staff meetings

There is no much change in the items the participants propose to talk about during staff meetings. As we mentioned in the last report, items to be discussed can go from "searching for agreement about how to act in specific situations or in front of specific attitudes/acts of the person" and "searching for new ways to work with the person, because the current ones are not having the desired effect" to "analyzing the way they see the person".

Some professionals have written in their protocols that they have already brought these items up during staff meetings.