

## POSSIBILITIES AND CHALLENGES OF PIBID TO THE NARROWING OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

### *POSSIBILIDADES E DESAFIOS DO PIBID PARA O ESTREITAMENTO DA RELAÇÃO ENTRE ESCOLA E UNIVERSIDADE*

### *POSIBILIDADES Y DESAFÍOS DEL PIBID PARA FORTALECER LA RELACIÓN ENTRE LA ESCUELA Y LA UNIVERSIDAD*

Natalia Neves Macedo DEIMLING<sup>1</sup>  
Aline Maria de Medeiros Rodrigues REALI<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** In this article we present an analysis of the influences of Institutional Scholarship Initiative Program in the narrowing of the relation between school and university. For this analysis, interviews were conducted with 18 teachers (between coordinators, collaborators, and supervisors) and 48 scholarship students from four PIBID subprojects of a Brazilian federal university between the years of 2013 and 2014. For the analysis and discussion of the data we used the techniques of triangulation and creation of analysis categories. Among other aspects, the results show that the Program has favoured the approach between school and university and contributed to the demystification of the conception of superiority of one over the other. However, some aspects were pointed out as limiting, such as the university's lack of support for the activities carried out and the lack of formation and support from the teaching networks to the supervisors for the planning and orientation of the scholarship students.

**KEYWORDS:** Teacher formation. Teaching initiation program. School-university integration.

**RESUMO:** Neste artigo temos por objetivo analisar de que maneira as orientações do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência têm sido desenvolvidas e interpretadas por diferentes sujeitos que compõem o Programa na relação entre as escolas de educação básica e a universidade. Para essa análise foram realizadas entrevistas com 18 professores (entre coordenadores, colaboradores e supervisores) e 48 estudantes bolsistas de quatro subprojetos do PIBID de uma universidade federal brasileira entre os anos de 2013 e 2014. Entre outros aspectos, os resultados mostram que o Programa favorece a aproximação entre escola e universidade e contribui para a desmistificação da concepção de superioridade de uma sobre a outra. Todavia, alguns aspectos foram apontados como limitantes, tais como o pouco apoio da universidade às atividades realizadas e a falta de formação e de apoio das redes de ensino aos supervisores para o planejamento e orientação dos estudantes bolsistas.

<sup>1</sup> Federal Technological University of Paraná (UTFPR), Campo Mourão – PR – Brazil. Adjunct Professor at the Academic Department of Chemistry. Doctorate in Education (UFSCAR). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8394-3132>. E-mail: [natanema@gmail.com](mailto:natanema@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCAR), São Carlos – SP – Brazil. Full Professor at the Department of Pedagogical Theories and Practices. Doctorate in Psychology (Experimental Psychology) (USP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4915-8127>. E-mail: [alinereali@gmail.com](mailto:alinereali@gmail.com)

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Formação de professores. Programa de iniciação à docência. Integração escola-universidade.*

**RESUMEN:** *En este artículo pretendemos analizar cómo las pautas del Programa Institucional de Iniciación para la Enseñanza han sido desarrolladas e interpretadas por diferentes sujetos que conforman el Programa en la relación entre las escuelas de educación básica y la universidad. Para este análisis, se realizaron entrevistas con 18 profesores (incluidos coordinadores, colaboradores y supervisores) y 48 estudiantes becados de cuatro subproyectos PIBID de una universidad federal brasileña entre los años 2013 y 2014. Entre otros aspectos, los resultados muestran que el Programa favorece la aproximación entre la escuela y la universidad y contribuye a desmitificar la concepción de superioridad de uno sobre el otro. Sin embargo, algunos aspectos se señalaron como limitantes, como el poco apoyo de la universidad a las actividades realizadas y la falta de capacitación y apoyo de las redes educativas a los supervisores para la planificación y orientación de los estudiantes becados.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Formación docente. Programa de iniciación docente. Integración escuela-universidad.*

### **Initial considerations**

The Institutional Program for Teaching Initiation Scholarship (PIBID), articulated with the National Policy for Teacher Formation in Brazil, was established under the Ministry of Education (MEC), the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and the Fund National Development of Education (FNDE) by Normative Ordinance no. 38, of 12 December 2007, and regulated by Decree no. 7.219, of 24 June 2010. In accordance with Ordinance no. 259, of 17 December 2019 (BRASIL, 2019), PIBID grants scholarships both to students who are regularly enrolled in teaching degree courses and who have completed up to 60% of the undergraduate course workload when entering the program, as well as to coordinators and supervisors responsible for the development of the project, with aid for expenses related to it. It is a Program composed of different subjects who, with different roles and responsibilities, work to achieve the formation objectives. Each Higher Education Institution (HEI) can submit only one institutional project from which all area subprojects depart. For each project, only one institutional coordination grant is granted by Capes. The institutional coordinator is the professor at the Higher Education Institution (HEI) responsible to Capes for monitoring, organizing and carrying out the teaching initiation activities provided for in the institution's project, and the area coordinator is the teacher of the licensure, who must be responsible for the coordination of the area subproject (with an area



coordinator for each subproject) before the institutional coordination of the HEI, as well as preparing, developing and monitoring the activities foreseen in the subproject. The supervising teacher is a public-school teacher who, integrated into the area subproject, receives teaching initiation scholarship holders, undergraduate students, in order to accompany and supervise them in their activities at the school.

According to data published as of March 2014, 284 Higher Education Institutions across the country started to participate in the PIBID, developing 313 teaching initiation projects in more than five thousand public schools of basic education. In 2016, the number of active scholarships in the Program reached a total of 72,057 – 58,055 for teaching degree students, 9,019 for basic education teachers and 4,983 for teachers of teaching degree courses (BRASIL, 2018).

Recently, PIBID underwent reformulation, having been regulated by Gab Ordinance no. 45, of 12 March 2018 (BRASIL, 2018), in collaboration, together with the Pedagogical Residency Program, another training complementation program proposed by the MEC for the degree courses. In 2019, this Ordinance was revoked, with Ordinance no. 259, of 17 December 2019 (BRASIL, 2019), to regulate the PIBID, maintaining the collaboration regime between the programs.

According to Decree no. 7,219/2010, the PIBID has the following objectives:

I – encourage the formation of higher-level teachers for basic education; II – contribute to the appreciation of teaching; III – raise the quality of initial teacher formation in teaching degree courses, promoting the **integration between higher education and basic education**; IV – **inserting graduates in the daily life of schools in the public education network**, providing them with opportunities to create and participate in innovative and interdisciplinary methodological, technological and teaching practices experiences that seek to overcome problems identified in the teaching-learning process; V – encourage public schools of basic education, mobilizing their teachers as co-educators of future teachers and making them protagonists in the processes of initial formation for teaching; VI - contribute to the articulation between theory and practice necessary for the formation of teachers, raising the quality of academic actions in teaching degree courses (BRASIL, 2010, p. 4, author's highlights, our translation).

Although PIBID is configured as one of the emergency solutions triggered by the federal government to try to fill the shortage of basic education teachers and keep students in teaching degree courses, we cannot disregard the importance of some of the goals outlined by this program and its feasibility possibilities in terms of teacher education, especially in a period of structural crisis in society that has been increasingly aggravated by the current political situation, attacking Brazilian education in its different dimensions head on.

Considering these aspects and aiming to expand and contribute to the investigations that have been carried out in recent years on the importance and social and educational validity of this Program, we must carry out an analysis of the impacts of PIBID on the relationship between the university and the school, from the perspective of those who make up the Program. Thus, our objective in this article is to analyze the dialogue between the university and public schools from the experiences provided by the PIBID, considering the discussion on the influences of this Program on the relationship between school and university from the perspective of subjects who participate in it.

This is one of the categories of analysis discussed in a qualitative approach research that had in the document analysis and in the semi-structured interview the main instruments for data construction and in the triangulation and categorization<sup>3</sup> the data analysis techniques (LÜDKE; ANDRÉ, 2014). The analyzed interviews were carried out with an institutional coordinator, two coordinators of the area of management of educational processes, four area coordinators, four collaborating professors, seven supervisory professors and 48 scholarship students from four PIBID subprojects of a Brazilian federal university located in the South region of Brazil in the years 2013 and 2014<sup>4</sup>. This institution was chosen because it is multicampi, covering all regions of the state in which it is located, as well as its adherence to the Program by all the Teaching Degree courses offered. Furthermore, this choice was made due to the ease and availability of contact with its professors and students.

The university in question offers 17 degree courses on all its campuses. They are the teaching degree courses in: Chemistry (5 campuses), Mathematics (4 campuses), Physics (1 campus), Informatics (1 campus), Letters – Portuguese (1 campus) Letters - English (1 campus) Portuguese – English Language (1 campus) and Biological Sciences (3 campuses). As we can see, despite covering all major areas of knowledge, most undergraduate courses include the exact sciences area.

In 2009, at a time when some teaching degree courses were consolidated and others were created, the institution sent a proposal for an Institutional Project to Capes with a view to joining PIBID. In 2010, the year the PIBID began at the analyzed university, the Program had 125 teaching initiation scholarships, which were expanded to 195 in 2011 and to 261 in

<sup>3</sup> Based on an analogy, in which multiple readings are taken to increase the accuracy of the responses obtained, triangulation in the analysis involves comparing the data obtained from different sources. Analyzing the data in this way, it was possible to obtain different perspectives on the investigated subject. From the triangulation, it is possible to create a set of analysis categories (LÜDKE; ANDRÉ, 2014).

<sup>4</sup> In this study, the approaches and methodological instruments used followed the ethical procedures established for scientific research in the Human Sciences and were approved by an Ethics Committee for Research with Human Beings.

the years 2012/2013. Until 2014, 10 campuses of the institution participated in PIBID with 18 approved subprojects. According to data available on the Capes website, in 2014, the Institution received 433 teaching initiation grants, 71 supervision grants, 35 area coordination grants, four process management area coordination grants educational institutions and an institutional coordination grant.

The subprojects have different activities, given the specificities of each context and area of training, but they are all linked to the institutional project. Due to the impossibility of covering all the PIBID subprojects of the university in question for the study, we chose to analyze the subprojects of four different teaching degree courses offered in different regions of the state (one from the north region, one from the south region, one from the region east and one from the west region of the state), with a view to getting to know different areas and training contexts. They are the teaching degrees in: Physics, Letters-Portuguese/English<sup>5</sup>, Mathematics and Chemistry.

Below, we present a table with the main characteristics of each analyzed subproject and the number of participants:

**Table 1** – General data of the analyzed subprojects

PIBID of a federal university					
01 institutional coordinator			02 Coordinators of the educational process management area		
PIBID Subprojects	Start of activities	number of area coordinators	number of supervisors	number of employees	number of teaching initiation scholarship holders
Physics	2010	01	04	03	24
Letters-English	2011	01	01	0	10
Mathematics	2012	01	02	03	12
Chemistry	2012	01	03	01	10

Year of reference: 2013

Source: Devised by the authors

The analysis and discussion of the data presented in this article was based on a theoretical framework (FRANÇA, 2006; GATTI; BARRETO, 2009; GARCÍA, 2010; ZEICHNER, 2010; TARDIF, 2012) and on the legal bases that regulate and provide for the PIBID, in the national policy of teacher education and in the interpretation that the subjects who participate in this Program make about their influences, contributions, limitations and challenges in the relationship between school and university.

<sup>5</sup> Despite being a single course – Letters-Portuguese/English – the Letters-Portuguese and Letters-English subprojects are independent. In this study, only the Letters-English subproject was analyzed.

For the discussion of the data, some excerpts taken from the interviews carried out with the participants were used. For ethical reasons, the university and the four PIBID subprojects analyzed in this study were not identified. The subprojects were randomly named A, B, C and D, without relation to the order in which they were presented in Table 1. To differentiate the reports of the subjects who participated in the study, some acronyms were also used: Coordinator of the Area of Management of Educational Processes (CG), Area Coordinator (CA), Supervisors (S), Collaborators (C) and Teaching Initiation Scholarships (B). Thus, at the end of each report, the acronym that corresponds to the analyzed subproject is presented in parentheses, followed by the acronym corresponding to the narrator subject.

### **The relationship between schools and the university**

Different studies and research (NÓVOA, 2009; SHULMAN, 2005; GARCÍA, 2010; ZEICHNER, 2010; TARDIF, 2012) have discussed the importance and need to establish, in the teacher education process, the integration between academic knowledge, acquired at the university, and the knowledge of practice, acquired in contact with the profession. Some of these studies defend the idea of a true articulation between initial formation and the field of practice through the creation of a “third formation space”, an idea discussed by Zeichner (2010). In this space, both the university and the school would act in the formation of future teachers through activities, actions and strategies that were properly oriented and grounded that could contribute, throughout the entire process, to overcome or minimize the gap between theory and practice profession, still so present in many initial teacher formation courses.

According to Zeichner (2010), the idea of a third space comes from the theory of hybridity, which is the subjects' understanding of the world extracted from multiple discourses. This idea is also in line with what Tardif (2012) argues about the multiple and different sources of knowledge. According to the author, teaching knowledge is plural, composite and heterogeneous because it involves very different knowledge, coming from different sources and of different natures. For this author, such knowledge is at the confluence of various types of knowledge, coming from, for example, society, universities (disciplinary knowledge), the school institution and other educational actors (experienced knowledge), among others. Thus, starting from these principles, it is imperative to consider these multiple sources of knowledge in the process of teacher education, which, articulated with each other, integrate professional knowledge.



However, for formation to be developed in this perspective, it is necessary, in addition to a solid understanding of academic and disciplinary content, that future teachers maintain contact with the professional context at a time considered by Zeichner (2010) as insertion into practice, under the careful guidance of a class teacher. Such contact must go beyond, however, that carried out in situations of supervised internship or teaching practices, in which, in many cases, practice is often considered the field of application of the theory acquired at the university. In addition, the insertion should provide, in addition to contact with the context of practice, their understanding from the theoretical-practical knowledge acquired in the teaching degree course, as well as these should be used as a subsidy to problematize the practice and teaching experience. Such proposal, however, assumes that the partnership between university and school is carried out in a less hierarchical manner, constituting a new learning opportunity for teachers in formation.

From the interviews carried out with the participants, we can observe that the PIBID has, to a certain extent, contributed to the construction of this collaborative work between the two spheres. When asked about the existence of this relationship, some of them reported:

*I believe that one of the contributions [of PIBID] is the **demystification that those who work at the university are more important than those who are working in basic education** because of the collaborative work that the two agencies carry out in the formation of future teachers (DCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*Yes, I think so. I think it helps both sides, because it **allows this initial formation of our students, it allows the continued formation of teachers**, because whether they like it or not, they [supervisory teachers] are in contact with new things, new ways of approaching, new texts, new studies because they are here. So that helps there. And even more in the students, because then the students will not be tied to a single class, to a single type of teaching, they will be able to see other things in different ways. So, I think it's collaboration everywhere (DC, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*I think it's both, I think. Because as we help, I think, as the university goes to school, we end up helping students and providing differentiated classes, they end up helping us too, because I know, if I didn't have the PIBID, I think in the internship I would have difficulties, because I had never entered a classroom as a non-student and PIBID, at that point, helped me. In the beginning, I was ashamed, and it was difficult, so I think we help students and teachers too, because we end up giving them ideas, as students help us too. So, I think maybe there, there's a relationship (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

Also, according to some of the participants, the partnership between these two institutions has also provided some of the basic education students with knowledge and contact with the University, its activities and structure:

*We have already brought some groups here to visit the laboratory here at the [university] (AS, 2013, our translation).*

*The professor [supervisor] will bring his students here tomorrow to visit the university, the students who work with the PIBID students. So tomorrow we will receive them here in the morning, so they will stay with us tomorrow together with the PIBID students. So, I see that this interaction we managed (BCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

However, we agree with França (2006) when he states that thinking about the possibility of building partnerships between university and school necessarily implies a greater understanding on the part of professionals from both institutions about their role as educators. In the specific case of PIBID, it implies the appreciation, work, commitment and involvement of both the university community and the school community in the work carried out, with a view to developing practices as committed as those that are carried out daily by many teachers in schools. With this, it would be possible to aim for a qualitatively better formation of all those directly or indirectly involved in the Program. Such work, however, demands greater openness and counterpart on the part of both institutions in order to provide a collaborative action that defines the bases for the objectives proposed by the Program for the formation and performance of those involved.

### **The role of the university in the teaching initiation process**

According to data obtained from the interviews, the analyzed University has offered, in some situations, a counterpart for the development of PIBID's activities. This can be evidenced in the institutional coordinator's narrative, according to which the institution provides, when necessary, logistical, transport and cost support for some Program activities. The same can be seen in the reports of one of the area coordinators interviewed. However, based on the reports of the other study participants, there is a lack of support from the university, especially regarding the provision of space for meetings and meetings between the participants, as well as for the discussion and planning of the actions that will be carried out. When asked about the existence or not of the university's counterpart to PIBID, two area coordinators reported:



No. It doesn't. The support we had from our department and mainly from the coordination of the course, when there was a physical restructuring here, chemistry left and we gained more space. Our demand was met by the course coordinator, who understood perfectly and helped us and the department head. But the [institutional coordinator] doesn't have that from the university. This he will be able to tell you a little better. **He doesn't have a room. We need to have a room so we can work for PIBID**, because, after all, this demands... Even more so the institutional coordinator... A room with a computer, with a printer... It's the least we ask for. But unfortunately he didn't manage to get it. He works, you see there, with us, in the room using the structure of the room. Telephone... He needs to make calls... **Sometimes they are delicate calls that he has to make and he is there among four other teachers. Including a PIBID coordinator, so he doesn't have privacy and that, I think the university... We understand the lack of structure it has, but the university, I think, is opening up many... Participating in many processes, many projects, and the demand for space is lagging a little behind, a little to be desired** (ACA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).

**The support remains in the promise for now because I asked for a room for PIBID because a project like this has a very nice scope and the room I use today is not the PIBID room, it is the room of the teaching laboratory of [specific content D] which is almost being known by everyone as the PIBID room because they use it all the time. So, I would like a room at the university. Our support is towards the opening of the notice, these things, but it is precisely because of this that perhaps PIBID is quite autonomous, I would say. We even communicate what we are doing, but we are not asking for what can or cannot be done. Then I go to my coordinator and say, "look, I'm going to do a workshop in schools". I go up to the general manager and say, "look, I have 12 selected students from PIBID." I go to the undergraduate director and say, "look, I want a notice like this, something like that... it's ready, you just have to launch it". So, it's in this sense that I have their support** (DCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).

In some cases, the lack of visibility and support from the institution or from some of its campuses to the Program, or even the way in which the university and its professors have looked at, acted and invested in teaching degree courses, may reflect on their ignorance and devaluation on the part of those who do not participate in the PIBID, as can be seen in the reports of some coordinators and teaching initiation scholarship holders interviewed:

**Sometimes there's that "oh no, PIBID guidelines don't count, what counts is Conclusion Course Work guidance and such, internship". So, why don't you get paid to do it. Now they are being paid separately, so there is an overload... They need to resolve this issue, because it involves that over there, it involves a grant. [...] as much as I say, "oh, there are so many mentees, there is this, there is that, that other", but I have no relief at all, I have never had relief in classes or in the guidance of others. Because I'm a teacher, because I'm coordinating the PIBID** (CCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).

*Here [the PIBID] is still somewhat unknown, ok? Honestly, I've been complaining, I send e-mails, every now and then there's a public notice from the foundation, then put it at the end that has PIBID. **Scientific initiation and technological initiation personnel can participate, then I send an e-mail to and say, "listen, what about PIBID?"** Then he says, "uhn, I forgot", then he makes an erratum and corrects it. But here comes another notice and the same thing happens. [...] So I mean, **the university itself still does not know if PIBID is included in some activities.** So, this I realize. [...] There are professors that I don't even know who have PIBID here on campus. [...] and I also perceive it, there is, there is a certain contempt. **As if the PIBID student were less important than a scientific initiation student. And that I already noticed in here too. So sometimes in a chat with a professor or another like that, you realize that for him the scientific initiation student is more important than having 18 PIBID students for the campus.** So... it gets into that social issue, again it doesn't value the formation of teachers. Not even at the university do we value (BCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

***Some do not value it. Most don't. They see it like this, "look, it's wasted money". Why? Because you think a lot about that research. It's outdated thinking. Thought, well, is, "I want to know about my research, how am I going to achieve my research goals."** So, that matters. Because they see that an article in the area of education is less important... (CG, 2014, author's highlights, our translation).*

*The interns have to spend the whole day here, the student only goes home at night, and he has the right to coffee and we don't, we don't have the rights that PIBIC has, why don't we? They say it's because we don't work at school, but hey, we spend most of our time here, we have to go to the classroom, there's the meeting and we have to come here to plan the content and outside that we plan outside hours, so, **Why don't we have the same rights as scientific initiation, I think it's greatly undervalued, could it be because the project is new, a fact, or why? Because our group is a teaching degree course...** (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*Yes, I think that **in most teaching degree courses we are forgotten.** The other courses, which here have the engineering course, which has a lot of tradition, so it's very focused on the course itself (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*Two students in the course who are not from PIBID, they were joking like "oh, if I think that pure [specific content D] subjects are too difficult, I'll do my Conclusion Work on education". They said it well... then I was thinking "wow, but so far my colleagues devalue our profession" because in a way it is a form of devaluation, saying that it is easier, the other is more difficult. it's weird to think about it (DB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*I'll tell you a story that happened at the end of the year, there was a [subproject group] PIBID that was in the mini auditorium, so it took three days, on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th before the break, so the audience was practically ourselves. **It was open to everyone from the university, and I think that anyone interested would also be from other PIBIDs, even so, they did not attend.** There is no... Well, one thing the other group also*

*commented is that, sometimes, there is no contact within the institution between the PIBIDs* (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).

From the reports presented, we can observe that some participants believe that PIBID has not enjoyed the same value as other projects and programs developed at the university. Such devaluation, according to the participants, appears in different ways: among professors in the same department, among professors from other courses, among teaching degree students themselves, among students from other courses and projects, and among different subprojects on the same campus.

Certainly, whether or not PIBID is valued within the institution also depends – and to a certain extent – on its scope within the institution (in terms of the number of students benefited, for example), as well as on the dissemination, visibility and importance that the members themselves give to the activities developed in it. As we can see, there is a concern of some of the analyzed subprojects to socialize such activities with the academic community through seminars and meetings; however, even with such an initiative, many still seem not to worry about getting to know the PIBID and the work carried out in it. One of the reasons given by the participants refers to the fact that the Program is linked to a teaching degree course.

According to Gatti (2000) and Gatti and Barreto (2009), several academic studies show that in the Brazilian university model, degrees have historically been considered as a second-rate formation compared to other higher education courses. As a result, teacher education is now seen as a lower-class activity, and those who are dedicated to it are undervalued. According to the authors, this leads to a hierarchical order in university academies: research and postgraduate activities have recognition and emphasis, and dedication to teaching and formation of teachers implies a loss of academic prestige. However, as pointed out by Libâneo (2005), the lack of attention by universities in relation to teaching degree courses, combined with other aspects of the same importance, can hinder or even prevent the implementation of public policies for teacher education.

It is imperative that the university, as a privileged locus for teacher formation, supports and values the teaching degree courses, their students and the professionals who work in them. One of the forms of recognition can be given by the institution's valuation of PIBID which, according to the institutional coordinator and one of the interviewed management coordinators, has been satisfactory:

*Everything the institution could do to help us with PIBID, they did, in periods, for example, when we didn't have funds, **we needed to move to campuses, they paid for the daily rates, tickets and everything else, so they always supported, so this was the most important point, of support** (CG, 2014, author's highlights).*

*Another thing I'm going to tell you is cool, in addition to Capes' money, **we have a lot of support from the [university], you know? I've seen the [university] grant [university] rates to PIBID students because the project no longer had it, I've seen the [university] pay some costs, for example, for events that were organized for PIBID, right, because PIBID would not pay for this, do you understand? They ask for a vehicle, wow, they do everything. Because the [university] could understand, "oh no, PIBID has its resources, so we're not going to give anything". On the contrary, wow, the dean of graduation embraced the project like that, and everything we really need and they can do, they do. Even without bureaucracy too, interacting and such. [...] So, hey, how could you not work well when the university itself embraced the project? But it doesn't do this just for PIBID, it's not the darling child. It does it for everyone. It does for other things and such. But see, in that case, we're treated pretty well. [...] Of course, this can be at the campus level, too, it can be too. I don't know the reality of all campuses** (CI, 2014, author's highlights, our translation).*

As we can see in the reports, the University has, at least on the main campus, acted as a support point for PIBID in its needs, especially those related to financial resources. However, considering the scope of the project and the multi-campus nature of the institution, it is necessary that not only one campus, but all campuses, in the role of their directors, support and value the Program in its dimensions and needs.

Considering the university as one of the centers that integrate the Program, it is important that it encourages and gets involved in the project, offering them the structural conditions and pedagogical support that are necessary for its development. And, considering the multicampi nature of the institution in question, this is necessary not only on one of its campuses, but on all of them, in an integrated manner. In the same way, it is essential for its professionals to give greater value to the work developed by both teachers and students in teaching degree courses, as well as a better understanding of the Program as an Institution's Training Project. This understanding will contribute not only to the valorization of PIBID at the University, but also to the valorization of teaching degree courses and teacher formation itself.

According to reports from one of the interviewed management coordinators, the institution has valued the work developed by professors who are involved in projects, including PIBID, at the time of their career progression. According to this professor, this demonstrates, in some way, a certain appreciation and encouragement on the part of the

institution to the work carried out by these professionals. However, according to her, for there to be greater appreciation of area coordinators and PIBID collaborators, it is necessary that the institution and the Program participants themselves also consider it as a field of research, in this particular case, as a field of educational research, so that the results and production resulting from it are also valued as teacher research.

In her narrative, the area coordinator of subproject A also reinforced the need for greater support from the university for the work carried out by the area coordinators:

*Because, you see, many don't get involved because the university doesn't support... You don't have support... From the moment you're at school, it doesn't count as your workload, teaching load... So many professors [coordinators of area] think as follows... And I don't oppose their reason... "Oh, it won't count as my teaching load... So I go to school, I'll stay 10 hours a week at school, but the university will demand from me these 10 hours of permanence... That's not fair"... So, he ends up not going because he won't have it included in his teaching load and he'll have to do more at the university (ACA, author's highlights, our translation).*

According to this coordinator, the same happens to the teachers who guide the supervised internship disciplines, who are assigned the guidance of many students and the supervision of their activities in schools, without, in some cases, the hours devoted to this work in schools be computed in your workload at the university. The workload and the responsibility inherent to these activities – PIBID and supervised internship –, together with the devaluation on the part of some co-workers, ends up discouraging or even removing many teachers from these duties.

### **The role of schools and teaching networks in the teaching initiation process**

Basic education teachers experience a similar reality. Mancebo, Maués and Chaves (2006), when discussing the implications of the crisis of the reform of the State and the university for the teaching work, argue that this work has been marked nowadays by the precariousness and intensification, being one of the possible explanations for this the mismatch between public policies, formation programs, the organization of teaching work and the practice and motivation of teachers. Often, policies and programs are designed to increase teaching activities without, however, significantly altering their objective working conditions. In this way, more is required from the teacher under the same conditions. This reality is also discussed by Lessard (2010), who argues that there is a lot of utopianisms in the model of teacher education, especially continuing education, since he assumes that the improvement of



the school is essentially on the teachers. Hence the ambivalence of teachers in relation to formation policies: they distrust the autonomy granted to them because it is “granted” by higher levels; they see their workload increased and their responsibilities expanded and, on the other hand, they do not feel the proper support of their education systems.

According to data from interviews carried out with area coordinators, the participation of basic education teachers in moments of discussion and planning of activities and actions of the PIBID constitutes an essential element for the formation of those involved. Thus, for these moments of formation to occur, in some cases the schedule of meetings is adequate due to the times available by the supervising professors. However, even in the face of adjustments, some supervisory professors are unable to participate in the meetings held or participate infrequently. According to data from the interviews, most supervisory professors work 40 hours a week and in more than one school, which makes it difficult for them to integrate into activities carried out at the university and, in some situations, for them to work during intervention planning. It is also necessary to consider the fact that, as pointed out by Gatti and Barreto (2009), the number of hours per week actually worked by teachers usually exceeds the number of class hours reported, the first being higher, also encompassing the time used in preparation of classes, corrections of assessments and studies carried out outside school hours, which should be added to teaching time to better scale the weekly working hours of teachers. For these and other reasons, many basic education teachers linked to PIBID do not find time to participate in the Program's activities also at the University and, therefore, their participation and supervision end up being limited, in many situations, to their own workplaces - in the classroom or in the few moments of planning at school.

The area coordinator of subproject A chose to hold biweekly meetings, considering these difficulties and aiming to increase the participation of supervisory professors - and other participants - in activities and meetings, with a view to contributing to a better performance of scholarship students:

*In this one-and-a-half hour one-on-one meeting, we discuss strategies. I invite the supervising professors too to be participating when they can. Sometimes we make an appointment in the middle of the afternoon so the supervisor can be here. Then we... All the planning of activities, calendar, schedule, project development, readings, all of this is arranged in these meetings. I give them work. Then they send me, so I have time to read for the next meeting. That's why it's fortnightly. Then I work, they send me, for example, a bibliographic review, they send it to me, I read it, I get back to them at the next meeting. So that's why we give this space... Because we held weekly meetings, but we saw that it wasn't being productive. There was no*



*time for them to send it, do it, for me to get back to them. So, we decided to do fortnightly (ACA, 2013, our translation).*

According to the coordinator, constant contact with the subproject's partner schools and their participation in some of the classes taught by the supervising professors are essential to establish confidence in the work developed and encourage these professors to also participate in the activities carried out at the university.: **“I try very hard to bring supervisors to the university and for that I go to school.** Because when they start to see that I'm there at the school, they say: 'Hey, I'm also going to the university' [...]” (ACA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).

Certainly, the direct contact and participation of the PIBID area coordinator with the schools contributes not only to strengthening the relationship between the university and the school, but also to strengthening and enhancing the working and formation partnership with the supervising teachers of basic education that were willing to participate in this Program. In any formation process, it is not enough for the school and its professionals to enter the university; it is also necessary that the university, as a locus of formation, get closer to the school, considering it equally as a formative space and as a starting point for the problematization and analysis of educational problems and the needs for formation and teaching activities.

Candau (1996), when discussing the continuing education of teachers, argues that every training process should have as a reference, among other aspects, the practice, recognition and appreciation of basic education teachers. For the author, the teaching needs have their origin in practice and, for this reason, it is necessary to start from it in order to understand the needs that arise from it. This same idea is also defended by Tardif (2012, p. 23, our translation), according to which “the knowledge of the work of teachers and the fact of taking into account their daily knowledge allows us to renew our conception not only about formation, but also of their identities, contributions and professional roles”. After all, teacher education takes place from the moment we know the teaching reality.

Based on these principles, to us it does not seem for nothing that formation programs, such as the PIBID, disregard the reality of teaching practice and the experiences and needs of teachers. We agree with Ferreira (2006) and García (2010) when they argue that curricular proposals built without considering the opinions and experiences of the in-service teacher tend to fail. In them, the teacher feels like a mere maker of proposals developed by other people, which suggests, to a certain extent, the discredit of the teacher's profession. Considering these aspects, so that PIBID can also contribute to the formation of these

teachers, it is necessary that everyone involved in the Program, and not just the scholarship students, commit and worry about understanding and knowing their work reality. Only then will the actions and interventions proposed and planned to be developed in the classroom can have an effect on the performance and formation of teachers and future teachers, as the Program aims.

Likewise, in view of the PIBID's proposal to transform basic education teachers into co-educators of teaching degree students and make them protagonists in the processes of initial formation for teaching, it would be necessary for the municipal and state teaching networks to which are linked to make available the necessary conditions, such as, for example, time and space for these professionals to meet the Program's objectives and effectively act in the training of these students, future teachers. This is one of the aspects also discussed by one of the interviewed management coordinators:

*[...] Then they say, "We're going to participate in an event. We can bring money, we pay the registration", "I can't, I can't go". So, **their [supervisors] participation is very limited. Really limited.** They open up students to work in schools. The schools that we've been able to partner with, they've opened up really cool, the students don't have difficulty working. **The teachers are dedicated at the time they are there, but that's it.** So, there is no such return. We wanted, for example, the students, here, they have weekly meetings with the area coordinators, to read articles, read books. So, they do presentations. So, **we wanted the supervisor at that time too, but we couldn't have.** Several attempts have already been made, there isn't, we can't. And the management, it, cannot interfere much in this aspect, why what happens? It's kind of us going over the authority of the area coordinator. [...] So, I don't try to interfere. **But I partially understand this attempt at non-commitment, because they have a very high workload, and then there's all that problem.** To travel, you have to go, sometimes, many times, far away, who is the replacement for these people in this time? So, we have our reality now, that we teach 10 classes a week, 12 classes a week. **I want to see them exchange 40 lessons a week. Right?** (CG, 2014, author's highlights, our translation).*

According to a group of participants of the II PIBID Area Forum of 2013, in order for there to be greater integration between universities and the State Education Secretariat, it is necessary to encourage, authorize and make official the release of supervisory professors for the development of activities related to PIBID. These activities are discussion, orientation and planning meetings (at the university and at school), and participation in events, with a view to socializing, with the other participants, the work carried out through the Program.

In addition to the availability of time, if we consider the PIBID as a program that, by intervening in professional teaching practice, also influences the training of basic education teachers, it would be necessary for such teaching networks to incorporate the time they use to

work in the Program – or at least a fraction of that time – as part of their workload and that also considered it as a moment of continuing education for the purpose of qualification and progression in the professional career. After all, it does not seem to make sense to delegate responsibilities to the teacher without offering him, on the other hand, the necessary conditions for the fulfillment of his functions and the proper valorization of the work developed by him.

It is important to emphasize that the fact that supervisor professors are paid is, without a doubt, an advance in terms of valuing the functions performed by these professionals in the process of formation of future teachers. However, in addition to financial valuation, these professionals also need to have their functions recognized in terms of their professional career, as well as appropriate working conditions so that these functions are performed in a way that effectively collaborates in the proposed teacher formation and in the quality of this formation. And for these conditions to be achieved, an organic articulation is necessary between what public policies propose for the processes of teacher education and performance and the demands and needs of the reality in which such processes are developed.

Furthermore, considering the objectives of PIBID for the formation of students and teachers, it is also necessary that schools and the networks in which they are linked to get involved with the Project. According to the interviewed management coordinators, greater articulation is needed between the secretariats and regional education centers with the university, with a view to better dissemination of the PIBID, its support, encouragement, appreciation, as well as knowledge of courses and formation programs that are developed through the Program and by the university:

*I think that the teaching network should be more linked to the university, even to promote it to schools. Because, today, it's a lot, I don't even know if we can say individualized, but what happens? The PIBID is not disclosed in all schools. In general, the Education Nucleus, the Nucleus, sometimes receives information from the PIBID, and then, sometimes, it sends it to some schools. But **not all schools are aware of the program**. You see? I know that the Nucleus has been striving to receive the information that PIBID passes on, and to make this wide dissemination. But, often, **the disclosure stops on the principal's desk, too, who does not pass it on to the teachers. Because we know they often think, "well, it's more of a workload"**. So, stay there. So, I think it's not just school to go to university that's missing. The cores would also have to make a tripod with PIBID, to suddenly work better. Even to publicize courses that PIBID offers to all schools. Since it's not necessarily only the supervisor teacher, **why a teacher who is not a supervisor cannot participate in a course?***

(CG, 2014, author's highlights, our translation).

The establishment of a joint action between HEIs and the State Department of Education to strengthen the relationship between university and school was also one of the aspects presented in the report of one of the discussion groups of the aforementioned II Forum of PIBID Areas (2013). In it, Forum participants highlighted the importance of the State's SEED knowing better the objectives of PIBID, participating more frequently in its activities, giving them the necessary support, as well as analyzing its impacts on schools and their teachers. By offering the necessary material conditions, the representatives of the Regional Education Centers can establish the proper partnership and contact with the schools and universities that make up each project. On the other hand, the professors and technicians present warned about the need for a greater commitment from universities in keeping the Secretariat informed about the PIBID Projects developed in schools and about the subjects involved in them. In addition to these aspects, Forum participants also argued about the need for collaborative work between university and school, with a view to overcoming the verticality and hierarchy that has historically permeated the relationship between these two institutions.

This is also one of the aspects widely discussed in the academic literature on teacher education. As an example, we can mention the study carried out by Reali and Tancredi (2005), in which, analyzing the processes of approximation between university, school and family based on research carried out in public schools, they revealed the presence of superficial interactions built between these instances. According to the authors, in most cases the relationships between university and school occur vertically, predominantly from universities to schools, in a false dialogue during which each instance seeks to disseminate and reinforce its own perspective, disregarding the other's. For these authors, overcoming this verticality, however, would come with the development of collaborative work, in which partnerships would be built in a more egalitarian way, with respect and support for the ideas and perspectives of each formative instance.

The same idea is defended in the work of Tauchen and Devechi (2016), in which the closer relationship between university and school contributes to both being seen and valued as participants in the teaching learning process, where "one collaborates with the other in the renewal of knowledge". In addition to these studies, works such as those carried out by Felício (2014), Gatti *et al.* (2014) and Oliveira, Rezende and Carneiro (2021), who specifically analyze the PIBID, have demonstrated the role of this Program in creating a two-way flow between academia and the school context, contributing to the strengthening of collaboration between these two spheres. and bringing improvements to both the initial

formation of students and the continuing education of the teachers involved. Corroborating these works and advancing this debate, the participants interviewed in this study understand that, for the PIBID to be developed in a collaborative perspective, it is necessary not only to change the university's attitude and performance towards teacher education, but also a greater commitment and involvement of partner schools in the development of the Project.

According to data obtained from the interviews, the fact that some schools do not clearly understand the objectives of PIBID has made it difficult for some scholarship holders to be included and the achievement of some of the objectives proposed by the Program. Reports from several participants, especially from one of the subprojects, demonstrate that, in general, smaller schools located in peripheral neighborhoods of cities are more receptive and open to the Program and the University than central schools - or, in some cases, standard schools – which, due to their tradition and form of organization, are often not satisfactorily involved with the Program and its participants. This is also reflected in the attitude of some supervisory professors, as can be seen in the following reports:

*The teacher seemed like he didn't have time for us, because first we started in the middle of the year there at [center school], that was last year and it was planned in our head what he was going to do, and our group was something that was getting in the way of his planning, so he was reluctant, for example, to grant a day for our intervention (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*I think it should vary a lot depending on the teacher and, in this case, the school itself. [...] There are schools that think "ah, they're there to fill gaps", it doesn't seem like they insist on us being there, understand? (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*It varies from the teacher and the pedagogue also within the school. There are pedagogues from a period, for example, in the morning who like PIBID and at night they don't like it anymore, we see all that. So, we go during the period when we can talk to that pedagogue (AB, 2013, author's highlights).*

*Depending on the size of the school, you don't realize it. The impression I have is that the smaller the school, the more problems the school has, the more the participation of PIBID is evident, which then involves a principal, it involves a teacher... Now, if you go to a big school like that, for example, the [center school], the scholarship holders arrive there and the management has no idea about them, who is going, why they are going and where they are going, and sometimes even the pedagogue is not aware (AB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

*I think that, just as the university has to have this receptivity, the school, the administration has to give this opening for the teacher to work new things in the classroom. And these two [neighborhood schools] give that opening. The [center school], on the other hand, do not give it because it's more plastered, it's more standard, [...] it's already on another level. The schools*

*that are most deprived are easier to work with. On the one hand, because they are more needy, they make our work easier. But on the other hand, they are more difficult for us because it is a very big challenge for us to meet their expectations. [...] And eventually, when it's the planning week, [...] these schools that I told you about from the periphery, they have a greater receptivity, so they even ask scholarship students to participate, it's different (ACA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

According to the participants, there are PIBID subprojects in different areas of knowledge at this center school. However, even with a considerable number of scholarship holders, courses and universities linked to the institution, it does not seem to be involved with the Program and its formation proposal. According to reports from the teaching initiation scholarship holders linked to this school, they are not known by all the employees there (including teachers, technicians and managers) and are often considered only interns.

In fact, a teaching initiation program in a school in which managers, coordinators and teachers do not show themselves solicitous and involved with its objectives is of no help. PIBID is not only a formation program for teaching degree students, but also for basic education and university teachers who participate in it and, for this reason, it also contributes (or should contribute) to the university and school in the which these are linked. Considering this aspect, it is necessary that the school as a whole – and not just the supervising teacher – participates in the Project and is concerned, at the same time, with understanding it and contributing to the development of its activities.

However, for schools to understand and contribute to the development of PIBID, it is necessary, above all, to know it. And regarding this aspect, the supervising teacher has a fundamental role. As provided for in Ordinances no. 260/2010 and no. 96/2013<sup>6</sup>, it is the duty of the supervising teacher to inform the school community about the project's activities and share with the school's management and with their peers the good practices of PIBID. According to reports from a group of scholarship students from subproject B, the school to which they are linked knows the PIBID and values the activities carried out: “In our school, we are super popular. We are known, welcomed. It has other PIBIDs: Geography, Philosophy, Arts. The principal knows us, the pedagogue...” (BB, 2013, our translation).

According to this group of students, PIBID became known by everyone in the school – and not just by the supervisor teacher and management team – when they organized, with the supervisor teacher and the coordinating teacher, some activities aimed at the entire school

---

<sup>6</sup> Because all projects and subprojects in force until July 2013 had their execution deadlines extended until December 2013 and that our data were collected in the second half of the same year, we used the Normative Ordinance as the basis of analysis for this study. no. 260/2010 (effective until 17 July 2013) and Normative Ordinance no. 96/2013 (effective from 18 July 2013).



community in the period of the Cultural Week held by the school. Furthermore, according to reports from the scholarship holders and the area coordinator of this subproject, this school has shown itself, from the beginning, to be committed to the Program and its formation proposal. The same can be seen in the narrative of another area coordinator, according to which one of the partner schools not only knows the PIBID, but is also concerned, offers compensation and informs others about the development of activities carried out by the Program:

***There I know everyone knows it. The director sometimes sends me an e-mail asking how things are going, if he needs anything. I was even surprised by the first email he sent. Then he sent another three, I'm getting used to it now. So, that's so hard to happen, isn't it? Then there's the school's Facebook, and on the school's Facebook, they post a photo of the PIBID workshops, writing that it's from PIBID, so I realize that everyone knows it's a good thing... the supervisor has been following the workshops on Saturday also for the students not to be helpless. [...]** So I know that this hug, this recognition and this knowledge is happening in this school (DCA, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

The presence and importance of PIBID within the school are also reported by one of the supervisory teachers interviewed:

*So, at the school I'm at, there are several teachers who are participating in PIBID groups. Here at the [university] it's just me. But I have a Chemistry teacher, there's another [specific content A] teacher there too, a Portuguese teacher and such, who are involved in UFPR with the groups there, you know? So, **there are several teachers who have this, all the teachers end up bringing this work of PIBID into the school and the school is well aware, they are aware of what is happening. And the activities of PIBID, they end up appearing inside the school as well. It's not an isolated thing.** Like, for example, when there is a, some school event, a cultural week, something like that, PIBID is there. Sometimes the intervention projects, they are seen by the teachers too. So, I think it's a characteristic of divulging the work, showing what is being done, even in the relationship with the teachers. They notice and such, we also talk a lot, they ask how the progress is and such. **And we are able to report what is happening within the project with the students, who are involved, the groups who are involved. So, I think that the PIBID, the programs, the PIBID groups, they develop the work there, this work doesn't go unnoticed, you know?** (AS, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

As we can see, knowledge and understanding of PIBID by the school community depend, at the same time, on the involvement of its agents (teachers, managers, students and other employees) and on the reach and socialization of the activities carried out by the Program participants within the school. Naturally, the actions carried out cause – or should cause – greater impact on the teacher responsible for supervising and guiding the scholarship

holders in their insertion in the school; however, such actions can also be extended – as proposed by the Ordinance that regulates the Program – to other teachers, whether from the same area or from other areas of knowledge. For this to occur, however, it is necessary, on the one hand, the interest of these teachers and encouragement from the school and, on the other hand, the commitment of the supervisor teacher and other PIBID participants to inform and socialize the entire school community, in moments of planning, meetings and joint activities, the actions carried out by the Program at the institution.

According to reports presented by some participants, this socialization has not occurred in all partner schools of the analyzed subprojects. From the participants' narratives, it is possible to observe that, in some cases, only the supervisor teacher who accompanies them knows the PIBID, while the other teachers at the school, including those from the same area of knowledge, are alien to their activities: “The teacher, at least the one at the school I'm at, he understands what PIBID is. But the school, the other teachers, do not understand. The board, the supervision also think that it is more of an internship than the Teaching Initiation” (AB, our translation). The same can be seen in the narratives of scholarship students from other subprojects:

*I think that the activities we do are not used by other teachers, not that we know, because if it went through, they would say "look how cool, I'm using your activity". So, I think no one has used it so far (DB, 2013author's highlights, our translation).*

*One thing I have a complaint about the school is that the principals don't know us.. The principal doesn't know us, the coordinator doesn't know us, coordinator... (BB, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

Furthermore, according to a supervisory teacher's report, at times it is possible to identify certain resistance from school teachers and, in particular, from teachers in the same area of knowledge in exchanging ideas and experiences about activities carried out in the classroom. According to this supervising professor, the teaching profession is marked by individualism and isolation, which makes it difficult and even hinders the collaborative work and socialization of actions that are developed, for example, by PIBID within the institution. Therefore, the need for articulated actions between higher education and basic education so that this work of dissemination, collaboration and socialization of activities takes place among all teachers, and not just among the Program's scholarship holders.

According to two of the supervisory teachers interviewed, the fact that there is more than one PIBID subproject in different areas of knowledge in some schools could facilitate interdisciplinary work between teachers, which, in practice, does not happen:

*A [specific content C] can study Chemistry, History, Geography, any and all subjects. It is possible to create this interdisciplinarity. I really like it, I've already done it with Physical Education. I'm doing it now with teacher formation, with theater, short stories, which is the genre. I go looking like this with other teachers, **but others don't accept it very much, it's difficult... It's beliefs, each teacher works in their own way, [...] there's a lot... a lot of individualism.** Each one has a teaching characteristic, a belief as well, a profile, in high school... difficult to tell you that (CS, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

***There is no integration between groups [different PIBID subprojects], unfortunately, that doesn't exist there... I think because they are different groups, from different institutions, I don't know...** (AS, 2013, author's highlights, our translation).*

In this way, the articulation between teachers from different areas and the development of integrated activities in partner schools to promote interdisciplinary training, proposed by Ordinances no. 260/2010 and no. 96/2013, are no longer contemplated. As we have already discussed, just as the socialization of work with the school community, the integration of activities and interdisciplinary formation within schools does not depend exclusively on the action of the university - in the role of coordinators, collaborators and teaching initiation scholarship holders -, nor solely of the school - in the role of supervisory teachers and other professionals -, but of articulated and intentional actions between both spheres, aimed at the common formative objectives proposed by the PIBID. However, as Tancredi (2013) points out, in addition to collective actions, interdisciplinary work also depends on time for the professionals involved to develop a holistic posture regarding the production of knowledge. And, considering the difficulties in developing such a posture due to the format of the disciplinary curriculum present in schools, the PIBID can constitute an important instrument for the construction of a global performance among teachers and also between them and the teaching initiation scholarship holders and university professors, with a view to overcoming the fragmentation of knowledge present both in schools and in higher education institutions.

## Final considerations

At a time when Education and many of the training programs and actions that form part of it have been threatened, studies that contribute to the analysis of their contributions, limitations and challenges in order to strengthen them are imperative. From the results obtained in this study, we can observe that the PIBID has favored the approximation between school and university and contributed to the demystification of the conception of superiority of one over the other. With this, the dualism between academic knowledge and professional knowledge and between theory and practice is gradually overcome, favoring, to a large extent, the initial formation of teaching degree students, the continuing education of school and university teachers and collaborative work among those involved in the teaching initiation process.

In addition, the data allowed us to observe that the PIBID has enabled teachers and students of basic education schools to approach the university environment and, similarly, favored greater contact between the university, its professionals and students with the school context, which contributes even more to the strengthening and enrichment of the relationship between the two educational institutions. In this process, both the university and the school are configured as spaces for teacher formation, each with different characteristics, objectives and specificities.

However, despite the students' reports showing the importance that PIBID has played in the articulation between the formation field and the (future) field of professional activity, some data allow us to reflect on this. By demonstrating in their narratives, the potential of PIBID as preparation for the completion of the curricular internship or even insecurity in carrying out this internship and entering the school if they had not participated in PIBID, some students indicate the possibility that the teaching degree course is not providing the necessary and continuous articulation between theory and practice throughout the entire formation process. According to Felício (2014, p. 421, our translation), this disarticulation, although fallacious, has historically contributed to the development of a dichotomized formation process, “through which the polarities do not complement each other, as they are assumed to be divergent. In other words, knowledge at the expense of doing, theory at the expense of practice, scientific at the expense of technical”. In this process, the contents or theory are understood as the responsibility of the disciplines that make up the curriculum of the teaching degree course, while practice is almost exclusively the responsibility of mandatory internships or theoretical-practical disciplines that include pedagogical formation.

It is important to highlight, however, that the problematization of professional teaching practice, the school context, the processes of teaching and learning, the specificities of students and the working conditions of the teacher should not only be a concern of an initiation program to teaching or mandatory internship – or even of a few units of the curriculum –, but of the entire degree course, whether in its specific knowledge disciplines, whether those of general pedagogical knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge. In this way, the student would not participate in a formation program or enter the internship without knowing how to act in it - or from it - but would be able to continue and expand a process that had already been under development since the beginning of their Initial formation.

By contemplating a significant number of students in the course, PIBID can present itself as the hybrid space or third formative space, as defended by Zeichner (2010), with the potential to contribute to the articulation between the theoretical-practical knowledge acquired in the different subjects of the degree course, professional practice and daily school life, in its different dimensions. This would not only contribute to the formation and performance of students and teachers directly or indirectly involved but would also articulate and strengthen the partnership between school and university in the teaching initiation process.

From the data analysis, some aspects were also pointed out as limiting by the participants. One of them refers to the university's support for activities carried out under the Program. In some situations, there is a counterpart from the university for carrying out the work carried out and for the socialization of these work; however, reports from some of the interviewed participants demonstrate the devaluation of the PIBID by many of the teachers who do not work in the Project. For these participants, this devaluation is mainly associated with the fact that the Program does not have as its main objective the development of research and because it is linked to teaching degree courses, which have historically been undervalued in university institutions.

In view of these aspects, we consider that, in order for the activities related to the Program to be developed in a satisfactory manner, not only the Project's participants must be involved with it, but also the entire academic community, in order to link PIBID not only to a teaching degree course, but especially a project and a university teacher formation policy. Thus, not only will this Program become more valued within higher education institutions, but also teacher formation courses. In the same way, it is necessary that basic education teachers, schools and, in a broader way, education networks, commit themselves and get effectively involved with PIBID and with its formation proposal. As a matter of fact, the

participation of teachers and the school and the role of educational networks in the development of the Program was one of the main aspects discussed by the study participants.

The analysis of the data allowed us to observe that not only the formation of scholarship holders for initiation to teaching is favored and enriched by PIBID, but also the formation and practice of university professors and supervisors of basic education. Such contribution favors, in the same way, the approximation of these professors with the university and the university with the school and its professionals, in a perspective of reciprocal, collaborative and continuous formation that can, as a consequence, allow interventions in the educational practice itself.

However, if it is true that PIBID depends on the role of supervisory professors as co-educators and co-protagonists - together with coordinating professors and collaborators - at the time of planning, development and evaluation of initiation and formation activities for teaching, is also true the fact that most of these teachers are often in unfavorable work situations, which make it difficult to perform satisfactorily. Regarding this aspect, data analysis allowed us to observe that many of the supervisors, including those who, according to the interviewed participants, are committed to the PIBID's formation objectives, work full time - often in more than one school -, with little time to plan their activities, which, in a way, can harm their participation in a more directive way in the guidance of teaching degree students and in activities related to PIBID. Thus, it is necessary that such issues be considered when evaluating the PIBID and the participation of those involved in it, so that we do not get lost in the naivety of blaming only primary education teachers for the success or failure of the integration process of the initiation scholarship holders to teaching in the school context.

Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the fact that, within the scope of PIBID, schools and their teachers are considered co-responsible for the practical formation of future teachers without, however, having had the opportunity to discuss this issue in a comprehensive manner. Until then, many basic education teachers were not recognized for their effective participation in this formation process; his role was restricted, in most cases, to giving the space in his classroom to the interns so that they could make their observations there and give their conducting class, in compliance with the requirements of the formation course. With PIBID, these teachers are asked to share the formation process of future teachers, without even having been heard in this process and without, in some cases, formation and further clarification in this regard.

For this reason, formative actions are needed so that teachers understand and can effectively act as co-educators of future teachers in their first insertions in schools. It is,



therefore, the need to consolidate, within the scope of the Program and through the partnership between school and university, actions of "formation of educators", in which internal and external members of the Program - supervisors, area coordinators, collaborators, management and institutional coordinators, regional centers and education secretariats and school management teams – are involved. Such actions will contribute not only to a better definition of the role of supervisors and other subjects in the Program, but also to a better performance of these professionals in the process of formation of teaching degree students.

In the same way, it is necessary that the teaching networks and, more specifically, the public authorities adopt the PIBID not just as another one-off government program, but as a comprehensive policy of the State, focused on teacher formation, ensuring the necessary working and career conditions that allow these professionals to allocate part of their professional activity to this particularly important task in the practical formation of future teachers. As stated by França (2006), it is necessary to define more clearly which tasks are expected of these professionals and under what conditions they are possible to be performed.

We need to take all these aspects into account, after all, thinking about a teacher education policy implies thinking, with the same seriousness, about the objective conditions for the developed initiatives to materialize in the scope of practice. Transferring responsibilities to the school and its professionals in the formation of future teachers without the relationship between higher education and basic education being actually established and without these conditions being guaranteed can be configured as an additional restrictive factor to be faced in the formative process.

## REFERENCES

BRASIL. **Portaria Gab n. 45, de 12 de março de 2018**. Dispõe sobre a concessão de bolsas e o regime de colaboração no Programa de Residência Pedagógica e no Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência. Brasília, DF, 15 mar. 2018. Available: [https://www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset\\_publisher/Kujrw0TZC2Mb/content/id/6628725/do1-2018-03-15-portaria-n-45-de-12-de-marco-de-2018-6628721](https://www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset_publisher/Kujrw0TZC2Mb/content/id/6628725/do1-2018-03-15-portaria-n-45-de-12-de-marco-de-2018-6628721). Access: 21 May 2019.

BRASIL. **Portaria n. 260, de 30 de dezembro de 2010**. Aprova as normas do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência – PIBID. Brasília, DF, 3 jan. 2011. Available: <https://www.legisweb.com.br/legislacao/?id=224343>. Access: 22 Aug. 2012.

BRASIL. **Portaria n. 96, de 18 de julho de 2013**. Regulamenta o Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (PIBID). Brasília, DF, 23 jul. 2013. Available: [https://www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset\\_publisher/Kujrw0TZC2Mb/content/id/30798135/do1-2013-07-23-portaria-n-96-de-18-de-julho-de-2013-30798127](https://www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset_publisher/Kujrw0TZC2Mb/content/id/30798135/do1-2013-07-23-portaria-n-96-de-18-de-julho-de-2013-30798127). Access: 20 Aug. 2013.

CANDAU, V. M. F. A formação continuada de professores: tendências atuais. *In*: REALI, A. M. M. R.; MIZUKAMI, M. G. N. (org.). **Formação de professores: tendências atuais**. São Carlos: EDUFSCar, 1996.

FELÍCIO, H. M. S. O PIBID como “terceiro espaço” de formação inicial de professores. **Rev. Diálogo Educ.**, Curitiba, v. 14, n. 42, p. 415-434, maio/ago. 2014.

FERREIRA, A. C. O trabalho colaborativo como ferramenta e contexto para o desenvolvimento profissional: compartilhando experiências. *In*: NACARATO, A. M.; PAIVA, M. A. V. (org.). **A formação do professor que ensina Matemática: perspectivas e pesquisas**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2006.

FRANÇA, D. S. Formação de Professores: a parceria escola-universidade e os estágios de ensino. **UNIrevista**, São Leopoldo, v. 1, n. 2, p. 1-10, abr. 2006.

GARCÍA, C. M. O professor iniciante, a prática pedagógica e o sentido da experiência. **Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa sobre Formação Docente**, Belo Horizonte, v. 2, n. 3, p. 11-49, ago./dez. 2010.

GATTI, B. A. **Formação de professores e carreira: problemas e movimentos de renovação**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2000.

GATTI, B. A.; BARRETO, E. S. S. **Professores do Brasil: impasses e desafios**. Brasília: UNESCO, 2009.

GATTI, B. A. *et al.* **Um estudo avaliativo do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (PIBID)**. São Paulo: FCC/SEP, 2014.

LESSARD, C. Gobernabilidad y políticas educativas: sus efectos sobre el trabajo docente. La perspectiva canadiense. *In*: ANDRADE OLIVEIRA, D. *et al.* **Políticas educativas y territorios: modelos de articulación entre niveles de gobierno**. Buenos Aires: UNESCO-IIPE, 2010. p. 67-112.

LIBÂNIO, J. C. As políticas de formação de professores no contexto da reforma universitária: das políticas educativas para as políticas da educação. **Revista Profissão Docente**, Uberaba, v. 4, n. 12, p. 33- 55, set./dez. 2005.

LÜDKE, M.; ANDRÉ, M. E. D. A. **Pesquisa em educação: abordagens qualitativas**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: E.P.U., 2014.

MANCIBO, D.; MAUES, O.; CHAVES, V. L. J. Crise e reforma do Estado e da Universidade Brasileira: implicações para o trabalho docente. **Educar em Revista**, Curitiba, v. 22, n. 28, p. 37-53, 2006.

NÓVOA, A. **Professores: imagens do futuro presente**. Lisboa: Educa, 2009.

OLIVEIRA, S. A.; REZENDE, D. P. L.; CARNEIRO, R. F. Processos formativos de professores supervisores no âmbito do PIBID: sentidos atribuídos às atividades experienciadas na universidade e na escola. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. esp. 1, p. 982-998, mar. 2021.

REALI, A. M. M. R.; TANCREDI, R. M. S. P. A importância do que aprende na escola: análise de uma experiência de parceria escola-famílias e universidade-escola. **Paideia**, Ribeirão Preto, v. 15, n. 31, p. 239-247, 2005.

SHULMAN, L. Conocimiento y enseñanza: fundamentos de la Nueva reforma. **Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado**, Granada, v. 9, n. 2, 2005.

TANCREDI, R. M. S. P. Políticas públicas de formação de professores: o PIBID em foco. (Conferência). **Revista EXITUS**, v. 3, n. 1, jan./jun. 2013.

TARDIF, M. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional**. 13. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

TAUCHEN, G.; DEVECHIV, C. P. V. Interações entre a universidade e a educação básica. **Revista Ibero-americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 11, n. esp. 1, p. 527-538, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/RIAEE.v11.esp.1.p527>

ZEICHNER, K. Repensando as conexões entre a formação na universidade e as experiências de campo na formação de professores em faculdades e universidades. **Educação**, Santa Maria, v. 35, n. 3, p. 479-504, set./dez. 2010.

### **How to reference this article**

DEIMLING, N. N. M.; REALI, A. M. M. R. Possibilities and challenges of PIBID to the narrowing of the relationship between school and university. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. 4, p. 2502-2530, Oct./Dec. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16i4.14300>

**Submitted:** 21/07/2021

**Required revisions:** 20/08/2021

**Approved:** 25/09/2021

**Published:** 21/10/2021