

WORKSHOP REPORT

February 24th, 2009 in Florence

1. Agenda

Morning session (9.30 am – 1.00 pm)

1. Introduction and presentation of the “School Inclusion” project
2. Presentation of the Training Package
3. Discussion on how to evaluate the Training Modules

Afternoon session (2.00 pm – 5.00 pm)

1. Evaluation of Module 1 (Identification of students at risk)
2. Proposals to improve Module 1

2. List of participants

The teachers responsible for the five testing schools:

Carla Favilli (IP Einaudi, Grosseto)
M. Assunta Campanile (ITI-IPSIA Da Vinci, Firenze)
Marco Manzuoli (IP Datini, Prato)
Barbara Degl’Innocenti (IP Enriques, Castelfiorentino)
Daniela Giovannini (ISI Da Vinci, Arcidosso)

The ten testing teachers:

Fiorella Querci - Federica Corradi (IP Einaudi)
Giuliano Fantechi - Monica Santucci (ITI-IPSIA Da Vinci)
Paola Bertini - Paola Fiammelli (IP Datini)
Elisa Chiti (IP Enriques) (the second teacher was absent)
Erina De Angelis - Maria Napoleone (ISI Da Vinci - Arcidosso)

Research Team:

Mauro Di Grazia (CIPAT)
Giuseppe Italiano (CIPAT)
Anna Maria Giagnoni
Lucia Fiorentini

3. Photo taken at CIPAT offices, Piazza S.Ambrogio, Florence



4. Workshop minutes

Before starting the workshop the “School Inclusion” portal was presented and instructions to enter and use the teachers’ forum were given together with instructions to test the future modules. The ten teachers’ precise tasks were explained such as the possible individual comments which can be posted on the forum and integrate with the group, collective evaluation, the description of a personal experience related to the training issue, the two comments on the other teachers’ experiences.

Di Grazia and Italiano presented the result of the 3rd Meeting at Castlebar and gave updated information on the project. They made clear that the ten teachers’ main task is to test the Training Package while their cooperation in developing a final self assessment test for future users would be most appreciated. The agenda of the final meeting to be held in Florence in October 2009 was presented by Di Grazia, who highlighted the importance of the meeting to share experiences and best practices at a European level.

The SWOT method was unanimously agreed as the best tool to analyse the modules. The schedule to evaluate the modules was communicated: Module 2 will be tested in March, Module 3 in April, and Modules 4 and 5 in May. It was decided to post a collective, extensive, agreed comment on the forum, though all the teachers should feel free to post their own personal comments – which will be greatly appreciated.

Fiorentini presented the contents of the five modules providing some interpretative tools and highlighting how closely intertwined the modules are.

Module 1, “Identification of student at risk”, which teachers had already read and commented in school workshops was then analysed and a debate was open. All the teachers’ views were discussed and everyone had repeated opportunities to express their opinions. The comments were largely positive and some practical suggestions to carry out and disseminate the training package were given. At the end of the long debate, most of which took place in the afternoon, the following analysis was agreed:

STRENGTHS:

The module is well structured, clear and easy reading, topics are well developed and the dimension is right.

The most appreciated points were the importance given to learning climate in Chapter 1, the very well focused family factors in Chapter 3 and the Best practices of Chapter 5 which are clearly explained and exhaustive.

The teachers found Chapter 4 on the relevance of communities and social factors particularly stimulating.

WEAKNESSES

Web sites indications would be more helpful if more directly connected with the topic and the use of hot words would be most appreciated.

In Chapter 1 teachers felt the need of a paragraph on how to deal with the problems of immigrant students. Paragraph 5, Communication between schools is felt as most important but we should be also aware that information might make new teachers prejudiced against the student, a risk to be highlighted.

Chapters 2 and 4 could probably take advantage of a deeper insight. At the same time, some teachers think that such problems as mental health and the use of illegal substances are not so relevant.

In Chapter 2 the problem of the lack of self-esteem is missing, while the teachers all agreed to find it as typical of potential school leavers and would like to have suggestions about how best to tackle the problem.

Chapter 4 – A teacher whose school is located in a rural area pointed out that her students and their families still thought that education could help them to climb the social ladder, while teachers working in urban deprived areas agreed with the module. One common comment was on the role played by the media, which is not only limited to criticism about the quality of education. The responsibilities of media go much further: an analysis on the negative role they play in creating antisocial models could be interesting.

OPPORTUNITIES

The module offers new ideas and a broader, consistent picture of the problem which can greatly help teachers.

THREATS

The on line approach can be difficult for some teachers should we call it a threat or an opportunity?

The workshop finished at 4.45.