

WHAT INCLUSION FOR 0-6 SERVICES? PRINCIPLES, CRITICAL ISSUES AND EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

QUALE INCLUSIONE PER I SERVIZI 0-6? PRINCIPI, QUESTIONI CRITICHE E PROSPETTIVE FORMATIVE

Gianluca Amatori

Università Europea di Roma

gianluca.amatori@unier.it

Abstract

The integrated 0-6 system, on the international level, undoubtedly represents a dimension of profound interest from a political as well as pedagogical point of view. In our country, with Legislative Decree 65/2017, the rigid separation between the spaces dedicated to the 0-3 age group and the pre-school ones has been overcome (at least on the regulatory level), with a view to a systemic vision of dedicated educational care in early childhood. In terms of inclusion, however, some open questions still remain. The contribution critically examines two important aspects: the first, which involves the training of educators and teachers, in particular with respect to the dimension of inclusion. In fact, it is a question of rethinking a professional profile able to move easily within this renewed educational space. The second axis, strongly linked to the previous one, has to do with the competences from an inclusive planning perspective of educators and teachers, in order to more uniform the practices currently in place to make the educational responsibility towards children with disabilities or difficulties homogeneous and longitudinal.

Il sistema integrato 0-6, sul piano internazionale, rappresenta senza dubbio una dimensione di profondo interesse sotto il profilo politico nonché pedagogico. Nel nostro Paese, con il D.Lgs. 65/2017, si è superata (almeno sul piano normativo) la rigida separazione tra gli spazi dedicati alla fascia 0-3 e quelli prescolari, nell'ottica di una visione sistemica della cura educativa dedicata alla prima infanzia. Sotto il profilo dell'inclusione, tuttavia, permangono ancora alcune questioni aperte. Il contributo esamina criticamente due importanti aspetti: il primo, che chiama in causa la formazione degli educatori e degli insegnanti, in particolare rispetto alla dimensione dell'inclusione. Si tratta, infatti, di ripensare ad un profilo professionale in grado di muoversi agilmente all'interno di questo rinnovato spazio educativo. Il secondo asse, fortemente collegato al precedente, ha a che fare con le competenze in ottica progettuale inclusiva di educatori e insegnanti, al fine di uniformare maggiormente le prassi attualmente in atto per rendere omogenea e longitudinale la responsabilità educativa nei confronti dei bambini con disabilità o con difficoltà.

Keywords

Integrated system 0-6; inclusion; training of educators and teachers; inclusive pedagogical-didactic skills.

Sistema Integrato 0-6; inclusione; formazione degli educatori e degli insegnanti; competenze pedagogiche e didattiche inclusive.

1. Introduction: towards a systemic vision of 0-6 services

The challenges set by contemporary times have deeply transformed the way childhood is understood both at cultural (therefore, also pedagogical) and welfare level. The concept of

childhood as a mere “transition phase” towards adulthood can be now considered outdated: it seems clear, indeed, even in light of the scientific implications arising from neuroscience, that childhood is rather to be considered as the cornerstone in educational, experiential, sensory and relational terms, around which we build our way of being and understanding adulthood itself (Oliverio, 2017; Immordino-Yang, 2017). Already Maria Montessori (2007) stated that becoming well-balanced adults is only possible if one has been fully a child, emphasizing how the age of childhood should be considered a political-cultural priority with regard to issues related to citizenship, rights, relationship, and consequently to the promotion of a welcoming and forward-looking society.

From a more purely educational point of view, the relationship with a very young child oriented towards a harmonious growth is an issue that needs to be addressed with the utmost urgency. In this regard, educational policies at international level, promoted by the main world organizations, have devoted considerable efforts to the implementation of the fundamental right of every child to gain the best possible opportunities aimed at developing their potential, as stated by the Convention on the Rights of the Child fostered by the United Nations (1989) and then ratified in Italy through Law 176/1991.

The Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) is generally defined by UNESCO as «provision for children from birth through to primary education that falls within a national regulatory framework, i.e., it has to comply with a set of rules, minimum standards and/or undergo accreditation procedures» (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice/Eurostat 2014, p. 155). Hence it seems obvious that the benefits related to an economic and political investment in providing access to and participation in pre-school services able to support social, emotional, physical and intellectual learning and to promote the acquisition of new skills, apply to all children, including those with disabilities (Bianquin, Giraldo, 2021). Since the 1990s in fact, the issue of an inclusive education has been progressively intensified, becoming a priority objective at international level. Subsequently, the year 2000 saw the promotion of the Dakar Framework for Action by UNESCO, which led one hundred and sixty-four countries worldwide to commit to extending the social protection net, specifically aiming at widening the access to educational and assistance services for children and families, with particular attention to those who live in conditions of distress and marginalization.

The increasingly central role of the Inclusive Early Childhood Education and Care, also thanks to the various OECD Starting Strong reports (2001, 2006, 2012, 2015, 2017, 2021), is steadily favoring the spread of a vision for early childhood services which is no more welfare-oriented, but emphasizes the positive impact that these paths have in educational and social terms, thus guaranteeing a future quality life. However, there are still many issues to be solved, especially regarding the transition from the regulatory provisions to the actual implementation. At international level, as a matter of fact, inclusion in pre-school age continues to be highly heterogeneous among the various countries. A first element refers to two possible approaches: the first is of an integrated nature, in which childhood services are organized in a single cycle including the entire 0-6 years segment, with obvious positive effects also in terms of vertical integration of educational planning. The second approach tends to be more widespread and envisages a differentiated arrangement of services according to age groups (from birth to three years old and from three years old to the beginning of compulsory schooling). This distinction also pertains to governmental responsibilities, where the Ministries of Health or Social Welfare are generally responsible for the first group, while the Ministry of Education is responsible for the second (Amatori, Maggiolini 2021; Bianquin, Giraldo, 2021).

Already in 2009, the European Council had intended to encourage the promotion of Inclusive Education within the priority areas for ET 2020, starting precisely from those European countries in which participation in pre-school programs by children with disabilities was still

uneven and difficult to implement (Council of European Union, 2009). Nevertheless, after a decade and despite a certain increase in children participation in ECEC programs, children with disabilities in Europe continue to have limited opportunities to access to these programs, especially at a very early age (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019).

Italy experiences a rather peculiar situation in this regard. In fact, the Legislative Decree no. 65 of April 13, 2017 determines the establishment of an integrated educational and instructional system from birth to six years. This was an important moment for Italian educational services and pre-primary schools, which marked the transition from a split system (0-3 separated from 3-6 years, both from the regulatory and management institution point of view) to one with an unified perspective.

As far as the regulatory profile is concerned, it is worth mentioning the release of the “Pedagogical Guidelines for the Integrated Zerosix System” and the “National Recommendations for Childhood Educational Services”. In these documents, despite the clear references to the inclusive perspective, there is a perceivable need for them to be «specified and expanded, so that the perspective aiming at ensuring conditions of well-being for each and for all can really materialize in structural elements from which each actor can constantly benefit», as appropriately noted by SIPeS - Società Italiana di Pedagogia Speciale (Italian Society of Special Education) (2021, p. 1).

Remaining within the Italian borders, the pedagogical reflection concerning these issues has been heated for some time now and it has undoubtedly intensified more recently (Dozza, Ulivieri, 2016; Calaprice, 2017; Malavasi, Iavarone, Mortari, 2018; Amadini, 2020).

As we have already emphasized, beyond political issues, the establishment of an integrated 0-6 system requires special attention with regard to different critical issues, among which those related to planning inclusive contexts and to training educators and teachers emerge more incisively.

2. Educators and teachers: training issues and professional repercussions

In the aforementioned released Legislative Decree no. 65/2017, art. 1 thoroughly defines early childhood educational services as organized in:

- Nursery and micro nursery
- Integrative services
- Spring sections
- State and private pre-primary schools.

Pre-primary school has only recently – and with great effort – achieved recognition in qualitative terms as an educational and training space, distancing itself from the prevailing welfare-oriented vision also from a lexical point of view (in this regard, see the previous and obsolete term “scuola materna” to indicate nursery schools), especially thanks to a major restructuring of training paths for future teachers. Such change is reflected mainly on the initial training, which in Italy saw the transition from the acquisition of a diploma specialized in Pedagogy to a single-cycle five-year university degree program, articulated on the pillars of theoretical lessons, workshops, supported and supervised internship (Cottini, 2017). This five-year curriculum devotes considerable attention to school inclusion topics with 31 specific University Credits dedicated to “Training on the inclusion promotion in presence of children with SENs”.

Moreover, it should be reminded that the role of the specialized teacher is included in pre-primary schools for support activities and it is assigned to a presence class of a student with certified disability. To this end, teachers willing to specialize in support activities must enroll

in a 60 University Credit degree course after having obtained their teaching qualification. Therefore, a rich and articulated path which brings pre-primary school and primary school teachers together.

However, as far as the other articulations of childhood educational services are concerned, the situation is rather different: the same Legislative Decree 65/2017, in art. 4 c. 3, sets as a requirement for educators only the completion of a three-year university degree program in Education Sciences (class L-19) with a specific focus for educators of childhood services. This vision integrates what has already been mentioned in Law 205/2017 (“Iori Law”) which has effectively assigned legal and professional recognition to the role of socio-pedagogical educators (Cottini, 2021). On the other hand, nurseries do not contemplate roles for specific professionals to be assigned in the event of enrollment of a child with disabilities; from this point of view, organizational procedures are extremely heterogeneous and related to the provisions of the different local authorities. An additional educator is usually assigned to the group as a quantitative response to potential needs.

Elements of great innovation introduced by the Legislative Decree 65/2017 are the “Childhood Centers” combining more structures in a single complex or in neighboring buildings dedicated to the education and training of children up to six years old within the framework of the same educational path, taking into account the age and respecting the time and learning styles of each individual. As a result, the organization of the internal and external space should derive from a specific pedagogical consideration to guarantee that complies with the different ages and is flexible and harmonious. The opportunities offered by the center are many: it is possible to envision different 0-3 and 3-6 groups with homogeneous or mixed features or mixed 0-6 groups. The co-presence and coexistence within the same spaces make the centers a precious opportunity for research, innovation and experimentation in which children are undoubtedly involved, but also their families and the professionals who inhabit and design those spaces. What motivates and stimulates a participatory approach of the various professional roles is sharing a pedagogical culture: hence, educators and teachers work together to build high-quality space-time and relational itineraries. It is then appropriate to ask whether continuing to consider different initial trainings for nursery educators and pre-primary school teachers would still make sense in the light of the great innovations introduced by the recent regulatory provisions. A reassessment in this direction would not only be necessary in a broader sense, but also from an inclusive perspective. Despite the noble intentions, as we have pointed out, the topic of inclusion of students with disabilities has indeed been addressed generically and as a statement of principles, «not adequately emphasizing the importance of this existential phase especially with reference to early intervention and the global commitment to the life project, which needs a vision and a systematic organization» (Salis, 2021, p. 13). As a matter of fact, it is all about rethinking a professional role able to move with agility and awareness within the 0-6 space, equipped with specific cultural, organizational and pedagogical-didactic skills allowing the promotion of the educational path continuity and contributing to reducing disadvantages through the enhancement of a quality educational offer, guaranteed by the presence and coordination of specifically trained personnel. The importance of sharing a “common language” among the various professionals seems evident and this cannot be expected from the in-service training personnel alone: what is needed is a horizon of shared meaning which does not intend to make homogeneous and monotonous what already appears distinct, nor to emphasize differences to the point of making them oppositions (Sannipoli, 2021). The 0-6 segment is a challenge which must bring the courage to change perspective while remaining faithful to the own educational task.

3. The central role of planning for the inclusive process

In the previous paragraph, we have called attention to the importance of 0-6 services with respect to the possibility of setting up a welcoming and safe environment, to support children's interests and capture their potential, to extend and widen the educational experiences in order to fully meet the aims indicated by the regulations, but also to systematically verify whether these experiences have led to the foreseen results, or whether planning a different articulation, an enrichment or a modification of these is instead necessary in the light of the responses given by the children (Bondioli, Savio, 2018). More specifically in terms of inclusive issues, it is necessary to recall how early childhood educational services can represent a strategic context for the early detection of difficulties and potentially dangerous situations for children.

To this end, a vision of a curriculum able to be launched in an experimental continuum, namely an open curriculum, is increasingly necessary, as pointed out by Dewey (1902). That being so, educators and teachers must put their professional skills involving observation, planning and assessment/evaluation into practice (Galanti, Giaconi, Zappaterra, 2021).

The specific nature of the structure and the organizational features of 0-6 services allows to carry out observational activities of pedagogical relevance more easily, also thanks to the structuring of routines, to relational dynamics (involving extra-familial network), to achievements in autonomy and to their respective management. These aspects are particularly important with regard to the early detection of difficulties, but also to the possibility of effectively grasping children's responses to the offers made by adults and, at the same time, detecting and evaluating progress and eventually redesigning the educational proposal in order to re-evaluate its effectiveness. The observational procedures must necessarily be systematic and subject to analysis, possibly by the entire team of professionals.

Planning is never a lonely task. Especially within educational contexts, it requires a broader view of the entire network of educators and teachers and it must be able to be effectively declined inside the reality it addresses, while considering the wide-ranging aims moving and guiding the educational path. In respect of the inclusive aspects, educational planning needs to comply with the criteria of flexibility and coherence (Amatori, 2020), assuming an accessible and plural approach able to accommodate differences according to sense principles. When a child presents a certified disability, however, the planning dynamics are currently still dissimilar between pre-primary school and nursery school. In this sense, it suffices recalling the ministerial models of Individual Educational Plan proposed by Legislative Decree no. 182/2020 (subsequently repealed by sentence no. 9795/21 of Lazio Regional Administrative Court) which did not contemplate the existence of a specific document for nursery schools, but rather started from the latter and then moved on to other school levels.

The planning activity is always combined with the observational one: planning is indeed continuous and recurrent, since its intentional nature does not make it absolutely rigid. This should be well exposed in written form in order to submit it to critical examination, which subsequently enables a comparison between what has been declared and what is actually been done. Macro-planning activities (educational project) must then be conveyed into micro-planning elements (educational unit), within which contact points with the prospective IEP-Life Project of the child with disabilities are to be found (Rossi, Giaconi, 2016; Pennazio, 2017).

Even more so in the systemic vision of 0-6, we must consider planning as a horizontal and simultaneously vertical process. Especially when working with disabilities, it is of paramount

importance to integrate and share caring actions in a continuity perspective, which contemplates the creation of a heterogeneous path of development and growth within an orientational consistency rich in pedagogical awareness. Building a functional and structured network is crucial with regard to the actual ability of designing a curriculum which can look longitudinally at the Life Project.

The evaluation topic would also be worth further specific investigation in its declination compared to the integrated 0-6 system notably through targeted training aimed at clarifying the most critical aspects. The evaluation must be indeed conceived as a dynamic and complex process actively involving observation and planning, in order to reflect on the growth process of children and of the group, hence on the actual effectiveness of the undertaken educational actions, as well as of the environment organization by the adult. The tools that can be used to this end are varied and range from the use of logbooks to video recordings, written observations and check-lists (Cottini, 2017; 2021). Involving the families is crucial: in fact, the educational proposal can represent a hypothesis to be assessed (Bondioli, Savio, 2018; Becchi, 2002) whose outcome can also be detected thanks to the contribution of the same parents compared to the process of learning generalization. In this specific case, learning is merely educational rather than didactic and relates to the acquisition of domains such as autonomy, well-being, game, relationship, communication, which are operated even outside the school environment. These are the reasons why a careful reflection on the training of educators and teachers would be appropriate, which is currently disjointed and diverse, in order to further standardize their professional skills.

4. Conclusions and perspectives

Over the years, the school inclusion process has involved all the different segments of the educational path: from nursery school to university. However, precisely the space devoted to 0-3 lagged in the background, especially due to the lack of a stable regulation shared throughout the country and in the specific training for operators. The definition of early childhood educational services provided by the Legislative Decree no. 65/2017 had the merit of emphasizing not only the peculiarities of spaces for the 0-3 segment in educational terms, but also of having broadened the horizon to a perspective that considers the developmental age of the child from birth to 6 years in its entirety, which is also valuable in terms of inclusion and, in particular, of disability. Through the years, the lack of specific knowledge and adequate skills has led the educational approach to focus purely on welcoming the child with disabilities with the chance of extending to him/her the activity proposals aimed at others as far as possible. Today, the perspective has considerably changed also by planning environments and actions in a *for All* vision fully responding to the logic of an inclusive and forward-looking planning dimension (Cottini, 2017; Galanti, Giaconi, Zappaterra, 2021; Amatori, Del Bianco, Aparecida, Giaconi, 2021).

Nevertheless, there are still some critical elements which would require further reflection. The first one relates to the different methods applied to the initial training, as well as to the professional profile among nursery educators and primary school teachers. The time seems now ripe to build greater uniformity among professional roles, starting with the nomenclature and ending with the nature of the institution to which they belong. These aspects inevitably involve the educational dimensions which would seem by now to combine nursery-pre-primary school segments much more than those related to pre-primary school-primary school.

An equally important second aspect concerns the greater cohesiveness between nursery and pre-primary school services compared to the reception and care protocols of the child with disability, precisely starting from the drafting of the Individual Educational Plans in a

biopsychosocial perspective (WHO, 2001). All the more so, if these plans are projected towards the construction of childhood centers in which the co-presence of children from 0 to 6 years old and their simultaneous relational interaction would entail an even greater attention to inclusive planning.

The nature of such considerations must be primarily driven by the inclusion dimension: the 0-6 segment, in fact, represents a privileged and essential space for the early detection of difficulties, for timely intervention and the harmonious development of the person. Structuring an integrated system affects directly the possibility of looking at the child seamlessly, even through the definition of a meaningful educational planning, sharing a common language, principles and practices of care in the most authentic meaning of the term. Care that is guarantee of participation and intended as presence (therefore welcoming), but also involvement, competence in activities and a sense of self-confidence. This is an important reminder of the essential value of educability as the main thread of inclusion, far from the still pervasive and prevailing ability logics.

It is necessary to reflect upon the skills of the professionals working with this age group and accordingly of their training profile. Certainly, a university training course in which the pedagogical dimension is central together with a competent view of inclusion. Such objectives can no longer be postponed and are increasingly urgent, because they are crucial for the construction of a welcoming, sustainable, caring and valuing society.

Bibliography

- Amadini, M. (2020). *Crescere partecipando. Contesti e prospettive educative per il sistema integrato 0-6*. Brescia: Scholé.
- Amatori, G. (2020). Il maestro nella costruzione di contesti inclusivi: la didattica speciale tra coerenza e flessibilità. *Nuova Secondaria Ricerca*, 3, pp. 259-266.
- Amatori, G., Del Bianco, N., Capellini A.S., Giaconi C. (2021). Formazione degli insegnanti specializzati e progettazione educativa individualizzata: una ricerca sulle percezioni. *Form@re*, 21, 1, pp. 24-37.
- Amatori, G., Maggiolini, S. (a cura di) (2021). *Pedagogia speciale per la prima infanzia. Politiche, famiglie, servizi*. Milano: Pearson.
- Becchi, E. (2002). Per un progetto pedagogico del nido. In: E. Becchi, A. Bondioli, M. Ferrari, *Il progetto pedagogico del nido e la sua valutazione*. Bergamo: Edizioni Junior, pp. 134-190.
- Bianquin, N., Giraldo, M. (2021). La qualità dell'inclusione nel sistema integrato 0-6: promozione e sostegno alla partecipazione. In: G. Amatori, S. Maggiolini (a cura di), *Pedagogia speciale per la prima infanzia. Politiche, famiglie, servizi*. Milano: Pearson, pp. 31-63.
- Bondioli, A., Savio, D. (2018). *Educare l'infanzia. Temi chiave per i servizi 0-6*. Roma: Carocci.
- Bondioli, A., Savio, D. (a cura di) (2018). *Crescere bambini. Immagini d'infanzia in educazione e formazione degli adulti*. Bergamo: Edizioni Junior.
- Calaprice, S. (2017). La nuova Legge sui servizi educativi per 0-6 anni: DL 65/2017. *Studium Educationis*, (3), 141-144.
- Cottini, L. (2017). *Didattica speciale e inclusione scolastica*. Roma: Carocci.
- Cottini, L. (2021). *Didattica speciale per l'educatore socio-pedagogico*. Roma: Carocci.
- Council of European Union (2009). Council Conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training, 2009/C 119/02, [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52009XG0528\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52009XG0528(01)&from=EN)
- Dewey, J. (1902). *Il bambino e il curriculum*. Trad. it. a cura di G. Banzi. Milano: Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca.

- Dozza, L., Ulivieri, S. (a cura di) (2016). *L'educazione permanente a partire dalle prime età della vita*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2019). *Key data on Early Childhood Education and Care in Europe – 2019 Edition*. Eurydice Report, Luxemburg. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/5816a817-b72a-11e9-9d01-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-102611557>
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice/Eurostat (2014). *Key data on Early Childhood Education and Care in Europe – 2014 Edition*. Eurydice and Eurostat Report, Luxemburg. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/5785249/EC-01-14-484-EN.PDF/cbdf1804-a139-43a9-b8f1-ca5223eea2a1>
- Galanti, M.A., Giaconi, C., Zappaterra, T. (2021). Didattiche e progettazioni: storie e tracce evolutive verso l'inclusione. *Italian Journal of Special Education for Inclusion*, 9(1), pp. 7-14.
- Immordino-Yang, M.H. (2017). *Neuroscienze affettive ed educazione*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina.
- Maggiolini, S., Zanfroni, E. (2019). *Innovare al nido. La proposta pedagogica di Pulcini & Co.*. Brescia: Morcelliana.
- Malavasi, P., Iavarone, M.L., Mortari, L. (a cura di) (2018). *Educazione alla sostenibilità*. Editoriale. *Pedagogia Oggi*, 16(1), pp. 9-18.
- Montessori, M. (2007). *Come educare il potenziale umano*. Milano: Garzanti.
- Mortari, L. (2020). *Educazione ecologica*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- OECD (2001). *Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong_9789264192829-en
- OECD (2006). *Starting Strong II: Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong-ii_9789264035461-en
- OECD (2012). *Starting Strong III: A Quality Toolbox for Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong-iii_9789264123564-en
- OECD (2015). *Starting Strong IV: Monitoring Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong-iv_9789264233515-en
- OECD (2017). *Starting Strong V: Transitions from Early Childhood Education and Care to Primary Education*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong-v_9789264276253-en
- OECD (2021). *Starting Strong VI: Supporting Meaningful Interactions in Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris: OECD. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/starting-strong-vi_f47a06ae-en
- Oliverio, A. (2017). *Il cervello che impara: neuropedagogia dall'infanzia alla vecchiaia*. Firenze: Giunti.
- Pennazio, V. (2017). *Il nido d'infanzia come contesto inclusivo. Progettazione e continuità dell'intervento educativo per il bambino con disabilità nei servizi educativi per l'infanzia*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Rossi, P.G., Giaconi C. (a cura di) (2016). *Micro progettazione: pratiche a confronto*. PROPIT, EAS, Flipped Classroom. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Salis, F. (2021). *Dalle politiche assistenziali al welfare di comunità. Traiettorie e narrazioni per un sistema pedagogico integrato e inclusivo dei servizi educativi 0-6*. In: G. Amatori, S. Maggiolini (a cura di), *Pedagogia speciale per la prima infanzia. Politiche, famiglie, servizi*. Milano: Pearson, pp. 3-29.
- Sannipoli, M. (2021). *Verso un'infanzia claudicante. Servizi educativi, medicalizzazione e pratiche di cura*. In: G. Amatori, S. Maggiolini (a cura di), *Pedagogia speciale per la prima infanzia. Politiche, famiglie, servizi*. Milano: Pearson, pp. 169-190.
- SIPeS – Società Italiana di Pedagogia Speciale (2021). *Considerazioni sul documento "ORIENTAMENTI NAZIONALI PER I SERVIZI EDUCATIVI PER L'INFANZIA" - Commissione nazionale per il Sistema integrato di educazione e di istruzione (art. 10 decreto legislativo 13 aprile 2017, n. 65)*. <https://s-sipes.it/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Documento-SIPES-ORIENTAMENTI-NAZIONALI-PER-I-SERVIZI-EDUCATIVI-PER-L'INFANZIA.pdf>

United Nations (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child, United Nation General Assembly, New York, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>

WHO - World Health Organization (2001). ICF. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Geneva: OMS Press.