

THE TRAJECTORY OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER FORMATION IN BRAZIL: AN ANALYSIS FROM OFFICIAL TEXTS

A TRAJETÓRIA DAS DIRETRIZES CURRICULARES NACIONAIS PARA A FORMAÇÃO DOCENTE NO BRASIL: UMA ANÁLISE DOS TEXTOS OFICIAIS

LA TRAYECTORIA DE LAS DIRETRIZES CURRICULARES NACIONALES PARA LA FORMACIÓN DOCENTE EN BRASIL: ANÁLISIS DE LOS TEXTOS OFICIALES

Gustavo Adolf FICHTER FILHO¹
Breyner Ricardo de OLIVEIRA²
Jianne Ines Fialho COELHO³

ABSTRACT: The article analyzes the trajectory of the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCN, 2002; 2015; 2019) in Brazil along a cycle circumscribed by five governments (Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, Dilma Rousseff, Michel Temer and Jair Bolsonaro). The documents were encoded based on four dimensions; (i) motivation and participation, (ii) guidelines for the temporality and structure of the courses, (iii) teaching professionalism and (iv) professional development. By articulating the official texts over almost 20 years, the analyzes reconstruct its trajectory in the field of teacher education, marked by advances, setbacks and ruptures. Between 2002 and 2015, the DCN emphasizes a more critical formation, combining initial and continuing formation, in addition to professional development. The post-coup of 2016 reveals a worsening in the process of devaluation and weakening of the professional status of teaching, manifested in the DCN/2019.

KEYWORDS: National Curriculum Guidelines. Teacher education. Educational policies. Trajectory of public policies.

RESUMO: O artigo analisa a trajetória das Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais (DCN, 2002; 2015; 2019) no campo da formação docente no Brasil ao longo de um ciclo circunscrito por cinco governos (Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, Dilma Rousseff, Michel Temer e Jair Bolsonaro). Os documentos foram codificados a partir de quatro dimensões; (i) motivação e participação, (ii) diretrizes para temporalidade e estrutura dos cursos, (iii) profissionalidade docente e (iv) valorização profissional. Ao articular os textos oficiais ao longo de quase 20 anos, as análises reconstituem sua trajetória no campo da formação de professores, marcada por avanços, retrocessos e rupturas. Entre 2002 e 2015, as DCN enfatizam uma formação mais crítica, conjugando a formação inicial e a continuada,

¹ Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP), Ouro Preto – MG – Brazil. Master's student in the Postgraduate Program in Education. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5742-4264>. E-mail: gustavofichterf@gmail.com

² Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP), Ouro Preto – MG – Brazil. Professor in the Postgraduate Program in Education. Doctorate in Education (UFMG). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0956-4753>. E-mail: breyner.oliveira@gmail.com

³ Federal University of Ouro Preto (UFOP), Mariana – MG – Brazil. PhD student in the Postgraduate Program in Education. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0657-4649>. E-mail: jiannecoelho@gmail.com

além da valorização profissional. O pós golpe de 2016 revela um agravamento do processo de desvalorização e enfraquecimento do status profissional da docência, manifesto nas DCN/2019.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais. Formação docente. Políticas educacionais. Trajetória de políticas públicas.*

RESUMEN: *El artículo analiza la trayectoria de las Directrices Curriculares Nacionales (DCN, 2002; 2015; 2019) en el campo de la formación docente en Brasil a lo largo de un ciclo circunscrito por cinco gobiernos (Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, Dilma Rousseff, Michel Temer y Jair Bolsonaro). Los documentos fueron codificados en cuatro dimensiones; (i) motivación y participación, (ii) lineamientos para la temporalidad y estructura de los cursos, (iii) profesionalismo docente y (iv) desarrollo profesional. Al articular los textos oficiales a lo largo de casi 20 años, los análisis reconstruyen su trayectoria en el campo de la formación docente, marcada por avances, retrocesos y rupturas. Entre 2002 y 2015, la DCN enfatiza la formación más crítica, combinando formación inicial y continua, además del desarrollo profesional. El post-golpe de 2016 revela un agravamiento del proceso de devaluación y debilitamiento del estatus profesional de la docencia, manifestado en la DCN/2019.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Directrices Curriculares. Formación de profesores. Políticas educativas. Trayectoria de las políticas públicas.*

Introduction

This article analyzes the trajectory of the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCN – Portuguese initials -, 2002; 2015; 2019) in the field of teacher education in Brazil over a cycle circumscribed by five governments: Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2003); Luís Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2011); Dilma Rousseff (2011-2016); Michel Temer (2016-2019) and Jair Messias Bolsonaro (2019-2022). According to Diniz-Pereira (2016), the DCN for teacher formation was prepared by the National Education Council (CNE, Portuguese initials) in response to the regulation of Law no. 9,394 of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN, Portuguese initials) (BRASIL, 1996). In accordance with the Law, the DCN define the curricular and regulatory frameworks for teacher formation, instituting standards such as workload and curricular structure of teaching degree courses, in addition to issues such as formative principles to be considered by the courses.

According to Oliveira (2019), policies have trajectories, and this path cannot be understood in an orderly and linear way. According to the author, when analyzing policies - including educational ones, it is necessary to consider their advances and setbacks; how the conceptions of different governments shape their texts and how the interests of the actors

involved can interfere in their determinations. The trajectory of policies is dynamically defined, as policies navigate through different governments, organizations and multiple arenas, moving through social, political and economic processes, with their meanings, translations and interpretations.

The analysis of the three DCN was carried out based on the opinions and the resolutions that establish them: DCN/2002 (Opinion CNE/CP no. 9/2001; Resolution CNE/CP no. 1/2002; Resolution CNE/CP no. 2/2002); DCN/2015 (Opinion CNE/CP No. 2/2015; Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2015); DCN/2019 (Opinion CNE/CP No. 22/2019; Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2019). The documents were encoded from four dimensions; (i) *motivation and participation*, (ii) *guidelines for the temporality and structure of the courses*, (iii) *teaching professionalism* and (iv) *professional enhancement*. When analyzing the trajectory of the guidelines, we understand that the elaboration processes and the content of these documents provide important evidence about the different paradigms that influence the formation of teachers in Brazil, expanding the understanding of this field.

The analysis of texts, according to Fairclough (2001), relates to an unrestricted procedure of neutrality, considering that the reading is permeated by the references - the descriptors - of those who codify them. In the process of reading and analyzing the DCN, as well as in the studies carried out by Costa (2016) and Shiroma, Campos and Garcia (2005), the political contexts that involve the production of documents were considered, in the search for understanding the multiple conceptions that govern these guidelines.

We assume that the understanding of the scenario for the elaboration of these documents and the way in which certain dimensions are approached can provide clues about the conceptions behind the formulation of these policies and, consequently, of their trajectories. For the case of DCN, the combination of official texts that organize and structure this field reveals a trajectory of almost 20 years in the field of teacher education in Brazil. Such documents, marked by different conceptions, seem to intersect over time, which can produce diffuse effects in reaching degree courses in the country.

The National Curriculum Guidelines for Teacher Education: 2002; 2015 and 2019

Diniz-Pereira (2016) states that, in response to the new LDBEN regulations, which delegated to Universities the adaptation of their courses to the applicable guidelines, the National Council of Education (CNE) and the Ministry of Education (MEC) started in 1997, a process of preparing curricular guidelines for teaching degree courses, with proposals from

different “organizations, entities and institutions”. Also according to the author, initially the teaching degrees did not receive specific treatment in this process, which resulted in the incorporation of different conceptions of formation in the guidelines of each course. Subsequently, the MEC instituted a new commission responsible for the elaboration of specific curricular guidelines for teaching degree courses, but this time, without the participation of representative entities.

In 2001, at the end of the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the CNE published the CNE/CP opinion no. 09/2001, because of the activity of a Bicameral Commission of the National Education Council. The document listed a set of guidelines for the formation of teachers of basic education at a higher level. Supported by this opinion, the CNE instituted, through resolution CNE/CP no. 01/2002 and CNE/CP Resolution no. 02/2002, respectively, the DCN for the formation of Basic Education teachers and the workload of undergraduate teaching degree courses.

The DCN/2002, when demanding a process of discussion and adjustment of teaching degrees, represented, for the first time, a possibility of overcoming the formative model in force in Brazil. According to Scheibe and Bazzo (2016), for decades, teacher formation courses adopted a model for prioritizing specific content, in which formation took place with an addition of one year of disciplines in the pedagogical field after the completion of three years of specific formation, model known as “3 + 1”. The authors state that these DCNs have brought a new perspective to teacher formation, allowing for greater diversity in course models. By suggesting a reformulation of the teacher formation process throughout Brazil, they met a demand in the educational field.

Despite mentioning the possibility of advancing teacher formation by establishing specific guidelines for specific teacher formation, the DCN/2002 did not address all the demands of entities and educators, yielding to the interests of private institutions. According to Freitas (2002), they brought a perspective of light formation, based on the development of competences and skills. Throughout the document, the issue of skills development is treated as a central point of teacher formation.

DCN/2002 instituted 400 hours of practice as a curricular component. With this innovation, Diniz-Pereira (2016) states that practical rationality has started to guide the search for new models of teacher education. Gatti *et al.* (2019) affirm that, despite the possibilities opened by the DCN/2002, most teaching degree courses maintained their curricular structures, with formation centered on the specific contents of each formation area.

In 2003, a new political cycle begins in Brazil, with the governments of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2011) and Dilma Rousseff (2011-2016). According to Oliveira *et al.* (2018), this new period is marked by major advances in educational policies, including initial and continuing teacher education programs, within the scope of the National Education Plan (PNE 2014-2024), approved with 20 goals to be achieved in 10 years old.

In continuity with the various policies that mark this period, the CNE defined, in 2015, new National Curriculum Guidelines for teacher formation (DCN/2015) through resolution CNE/CP no. 2, 2015, supported by CNE/CP Opinion no. 1 of 2015, replacing the DCN/2002. According to Gatti *et al.* (2019, p. 72, our translation), this document “[...] evokes profound changes in formative institutions, in the curricula of teaching degree courses and in the attitudes of educators”.

By means of decree no. 8,752 of 2016, a few days before the end of the Dilma government and in line with PNE goal 15, the National Policy for the Formation of Basic Education Professionals was instituted. Dourado (2016), states that this new policy determined, in a single document, the national policy for the formation of teachers, pedagogues and other professionals in basic education. Thus, when considering the DCN/2015, in addition to other documents, such as Resolution CNE/CES no. 2/2016, which instituted the DCN for formation basic education employees, the National Formation Policy articulates the agenda in the field with more organicity.

After the parliamentary coup, in May 2016, Vice President Michel Temer took over the Presidency of the Republic. Oliveira *et al.* (2018) state that this government was marked by radical changes for the country, significantly impacting teacher formation policies. A landmark of this government was the Constitutional Amendment 95 of 2016, which froze expenses of the three branches until the year 2036. This New Tax Regime threatens important issues for Brazilian social development, including the goals of the PNE.

In August 2017, after completing the two-year period for adapting teaching degrees to DCN/2015, the CNE/CP Resolution 01/2017 postpones this period by one year. In December of the same year, the MEC announced a new National Teacher Formation Policy, with the Pedagogical Internship program and the expansion of vacancies at the Open University of Brazil (UAB) and the University for All Program (PROUNI) for teaching degree courses. Entities such as the National Association for Postgraduate Studies and Research (ANPEd) and the National Association for the Formation of Education Professionals (ANFOPE) opposed the policy, stating that its elaboration was done without the involvement of entities and

associations in the educational field, and ignoring the need for articulation between initial and continuing education and the enhancement of the profession.

Still in this period, the CNE/CP 02/2017 resolution, in a troubled process and with criticism from the educational field, institutes the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC) of basic education, resuming the idea of the development of competences and skills. Dourado and Siqueira (2019) state that the approval of the BNCC by the CNE took place in a "coercive and lightened" manner, not being approved unanimously by its members. In October 2018, the National Education Council, through resolution CNE/CP 03/2018, postpones the deadline for implementing the DCN/2015 by one year.

In 2019, Jair Bolsonaro, of the Social Liberal Party, takes office. In the same year, CNE/CP Opinion no. 22 supports the institution of new DCN for teacher formation, through resolution CNE/CP no. 2, 2019. In less than 20 years, three guidelines were instituted, revealing the advances and disputes in the field of teacher formation.

The trajectory of the DCN

Motivation and participation

It is important to understand a policy in its entirety, from the definition of agendas and the elaboration of texts to the implementation processes that give materiality to the policies. Thus, the first dimension refers to the process of preparing the DCN, addressing issues such as *motivation* and *participation*. We seek to understand two main issues, summarized in Chart 1: (1) the justifications listed to produce these guidelines; (2) how the documents reveal the participation of entities and associations in the field of education and teacher formation in the elaboration process.

Chart 1 – Analysis of the motivation and participation dimension

Dimension	Categories	DCN 2002	DCN 2015	DCN 2019
Motivation and participation	Production justification	"Inadequate preparation of teachers" in "a traditional format"	search for "greater organicity of policies, programs and actions related to initial and continuing education"	search for "adequacy of teaching degrees with BNCC" and its competencies (Law no. 13,415 of 16 February 2017)
		"Build harmony between teacher education", the LDB and basic education parameters and guidelines	"Break with national, regional, state, municipal and institutional asymmetries"	
		"Definition of curricula specific to the teaching degrees" that are not to be confused with the bachelor's degree	"Guaranteeing professionals with adequate formation in the different stages and modalities and providing greater organicity to the formation"	"Improving the quality of teaching and school learning"
	Participation of	"Long process of criticism,	ensured "the participation of	"A series of meetings [...]"

	educational entities	reflection and confrontation between different conceptions about formation”	society” incorporating “contributions from the public audience”.	with the objective of presenting and discussing the proposal”
		It mentions several entities and associations such as ANPEd, Anfope, Consed, UNDIME, among others.	It mentions several entities and associations such as ANPEd, Anfope, Consed, UNDIME, among others.	It states that “a series of meetings were held with different sectors of Brazilian education”.

Source: Devised by the authors

Both the opinion that supports the DCN/2002 and the DCN/2015 *mention several entities and associations* (such as ANPEd, ANFOPE, ANPAE, CONSED, UNDIME⁴) involved in the process of drafting the guidelines, in hearings, meetings and other spaces for criticism and discussions. Despite this, Freitas (2002) states that the DCN/2002 did not meet the demands of the field. Likewise, Diniz-Pereira (2016) states that the treatment given to the contributions of these entities was small when compared to the guidelines of bachelor's degrees. Both guidelines, again, mention the importance of the debate: the CNE/CP 09/2001 opinion mentions the “process of criticism, reflection and confrontation between different conceptions”; while the CNE/CP 01/2015 report mentions *the incorporation of contributions from the public audience and also of other documents and suggestions received*.

The CNE/CP 22/2019 opinion, on the other hand, despite citing a series of meetings with *sectors of Brazilian education*, does not specify names of entities and associations involved. In October 2019, several national entities in the field of education signed a note positioning themselves contrary to the new DCN/2015, characterizing the proposal placed so far as “harmful to the improvement of the quality of Brazilian education” and a “frank disrespect for institutions, teachers and students”⁵. Regarding the justification of elaboration presented in the opinions that support the DCN, all documents present justifications related to the quality of teacher formation and the quality assurance of basic education.

The 2002 DCNs appear as the first for the Teaching Degrees. According to Gatti *et al.* (2019), the establishment of these guidelines in 2002 is of paramount importance, since the field of teacher education in Brazil lacked structured policies, focused on the specificities of teacher education. Likewise, at that time, the publication of guidelines represented a possibility of overcoming formative models, which have long been problematized (SCHEIBE; BAZZO, 2016).

⁴ Portuguese initials for: ANPAE - National Education Policy and Administration Association; CONSED - National Council of Education Secretaries; UNDIME - National Union of Municipal Education Directors.

⁵ Available: https://anped.org.br/sites/default/files/images/nota_entidades_bncf_outubro2019.pdf. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.

The DCN / 2015, on the other hand, were published after a long national debate, articulated by the CNE. The opinion mentions the Bicameral Commission of the CNE for studies of teacher formation with various recompositions between 2004 and 2014, which is consistent with the statement by Dourado (2016) on the establishment of these discussions since 2004, with the involvement of several associations, institutions and entities in the field of teacher education. Thus, the process of discussing these guidelines, which began just two years after the publication of the previous ones, reveals that, in fact, teacher formation is a field of clashes and disputes of conceptions.

The opinion also presents the argument for the search for organicity among other formative policies, consistent with the period 2003-2015, in which several formative policies were developed and implemented. In addition, it argues the *need to break with national, regional, state, municipal and institutional asymmetries*.

As is evident in the 2019 opinion, the DCN have a clear intention of seeking consistency between the BNCC and teacher formation. The concern with the development of skills in teaching degree courses is also expressed, a characteristic that was present in the DCN/2002 and had been overcome in the DCN/2015.

The period of discussion of these last guidelines is shorter than that of the previous ones, between 2017 and 2019. This period brings indications that resolutions CNE/CP 01/2017 and CNE/CP 03/2018, which postponed the period of adaptation of the teaching degrees to the DCN/2015, already signaled efforts to replace them. This short period of discussion is also consistent with the statement by Dourado and Siqueira (2019) which, when dealing with the approval of the BNCC, states that its process of discussion and approval took place in a “coercive and lightened” manner. In addition, the concern expressed by Dourado and Siqueira (2019) indicates that the new guidelines may not have been thought through in depth, in dialogue with more interested actors, entities, institutions and associations, as was the case in the DCN/2015.

Course load and curricular organization of courses

The second dimension concerns what the guidelines determine in relation to the workload of teaching degree courses and their curricular organization. We compared three categories: the number of hours of formation, the minimum time for completion and how this number of hours should be distributed in the structure of the courses, as shown in Chart 2.

Chart 2 – Analysis of the dimension *guidelines for temporality and course structure*

Categories	DCN/2002	DCN/2015	DCN/2019
Formation workload	Minimum of 2800 total hours	Minimum of 3200 total hours	Minimum of 3200 total hours
Effective time	Minimum 3-year course	Minimum of 4 years or 8 periods	Not specified
Curricular structuring	400 hours of practice as a curricular component; 400 hours of supervised curricular internship; 1800 hours for content of a scientific and cultural nature; 200 hours for other forms of academic-scientific-cultural activities.	400 hours of practice as a curricular component; 400 hours of internship; 2200 hours of formative activities in centers I and II; 200 hours for other activities of interest to the student (core III).	800 hours for scientific, educational and pedagogical knowledge; 1600 hours for specific content of the areas; 800 hours of pedagogical practice, divided into 400 hours of internship and 400 hours of practice of the curricular components.

Source: Devised by the authors

The 2015 and 2019 guidelines advanced compared to the 2002 guidelines, by increasing the minimum workload from *2,800* to *3,200 hours*. This movement is in line with an expectation of robust theoretical and practical formation for teacher education. In the first DCN, according to Freitas (2002), the establishment of *2,800 hours* was due to pressure from the private sector.

The minimum time required for this workload to take place, however, shows a zigzag movement. In 2002, the guidelines instituted a minimum of three years of course to carry out the *2,800 hours* of formation. While this workload has been increased by DCN/2015, the minimum time for completing the course has also increased to four years or eight school terms. In 2019, on the other hand, the minimum time to complete the course was removed. This fact is seen with concern, since lightened formative practices can be endorsed by the lack of a minimum time.

Regarding the distribution of this workload in teaching degree courses, we can see some patterns. In all of them, *400 hours of practice as a curricular component* and *400 hours of supervised curricular internship* are maintained. The *200 hours for other formative activities* are present in the DCN of 2002 and 2015, with consideration of the student's interest in the 2015 guidelines. DCN/2019 does not institute this workload.

The 2002 guidelines stipulate that the remaining *1,800 hours* are devoted to *content of a scientific and cultural nature*. The 2015 guidelines determine *2,200 hours for the formative activities of the nucleus I and II*, described, respectively, as nuclei of “studies of general formation, of specific and interdisciplinary areas, and of the educational field” and of “deepening and diversification of studies of the professional practice areas, including specific and pedagogical content”. The 2019 guidelines, on the other hand, are more objective in determining *800 hours for educational knowledge* and *1600 hours for specific content*, thus prioritizing the specific knowledge field of each degree.

Teaching professionalism

The decision about *how to form* teachers involves understanding *what teachers are* or what they are expected to be. Roldão (2005) provides four descriptors that seek to explain the teaching profession - characteristics that describe and distinguish the teaching profession from the others. The third dimension is divided into four categories: the *specificity of the function*, or the specific activity performed by the profession; the *specific knowledge* necessary for its activity; *autonomy*, or decision-making power; and *belonging to a collective*, which regulates and defends the profession, as set out in Chart 3.

Chart 3 – Analysis of the dimension *Teaching Professionality*

Categories	DCN/2002	DCN/2015	DCN/2019
Function specificity	"cuidar da aprendizagem" "take care of learning"	"act directly in teaching"	"zeal for learning"
		"agents formative of culture"	"formative of knowledge and culture"
		"praxis as an expression of the articulation between theory and practice"	"develop socioemotional skills in your students"
Specific knowledge	competences	"specific, interdisciplinary and pedagogical" and "scientific and cultural" knowledge	competences
		"ethical, political values"	
	"specific knowledge"	"permanent access to cultural information, experience and updating"	"permanent access to cultural information, experience and updating"
"understanding of the issues involved in your work"	"result of the pedagogical project and the formative path experienced"		
Autonomy	"autonomy to make decisions, responsibility for the choices made"	autonomy made possible by formation	Pedagogical foundation of formation
			Autonomy with its "own professional development"
Collective	"interact cooperatively with the professional community"	collective work made possible by formation	"work collectively" as a competence
		"Construction, collective definition" of career plans	"participating in learning communities" as a competency

Source: Developed by the authors

The DCN / 2002 inform that the main *task* of the teacher is to *take care of the students' learning*. The 2015 guidelines, on the other hand, expand this task by stating that, through teaching, teachers act as *cultural formative agents*. In turn, the DCN/2019 takes up both definitions, affirming both the *zeal for learning*, as well as the formation of *knowledge and culture*, also adding, in its definition on the specificity of teaching work, the function of the development of the *socio-emotional competences* of its students.

When seeking to identify mentions that deal with knowledge that should support the formation of teachers (or that should support the performance of these professionals), we find references to specific, pedagogical or interdisciplinary knowledge, present in the three

guidelines. The 2015 and 2019 DCN, however, highlight the *need for permanent access to information, experiences and cultural updates*. This reference is consistent with the analysis by Tardif (2000), who describes its development over time as one of the characteristics of teaching knowledge. The 2015 guidelines attest to this temporality of teaching knowledge by stating that the consolidation of teachers' knowledge will come through their professional practice.

All guidelines refer to *autonomy*. However, they do not deepen their understanding of it. The DCN/2002 associate it with the *responsibility for the decisions made*. The DCN of 2015 and 2019, in turn, cite the need for it to be developed by training.

Regarding the category belonging to the collective, the guidelines provide simple references to this category, generally addressing the collective work, but without further details. The 2002 DCNs address that the teacher needs to interact cooperatively with the professional community, while the skills proposed by the 2019 guidelines include the professional engagement dimension. However, the 2015 guidelines address the need to build and collectively define career plans.

Professional development

According to Nóvoa (2017), neoliberal educational reforms have intensified a process of precarious working conditions - which concern a material devaluation of teaching - and the dissemination of discourses that deny the importance or propose the easing of teacher formation - a symbolic devaluation process. Thus, these two categories - material valuation and symbolic valuation - constitute the professional valuation dimension of our analysis, shown in chart 4.

Chart 4 – Analysis of the dimension *Professional Valorization*

Categories	DCN/2002	DCN/2015	DCN/2019
Material Enhancement	depends on policies that define "working hours", "career plans" and "levels of remuneration worthy of the social importance of work"	"the guarantee of construction, collective definition and approval of career and salary plans, with conditions that ensure working hours with exclusive dedication or full time to be fulfilled in a single educational establishment and allocation of 1/3 (one third) of the workload to other pedagogical activities inherent to the exercise of teaching "	Resumes goals 17 and 18 of the PNE which deal with "salary equivalence" with "other professionals" and the "career plan"
Symbolic Appreciation	"practices specific to the activity of teachers and the multiple competencies that compose them"	"broad conception and appreciation understood from the articulation between initial	"associating appreciation with formation" to ensure career attractiveness

	"should be valued	formation, continuing education, career, wages and working conditions"	" It includes the recognition and strengthening of knowledge and practices "
--	-------------------	--	--

Source: Devised by the authors

Opinion CNE / CP 02 of 2001 refers to the symbolic and material appreciation of the teaching profession. The text mentions that the competences and practices specific to the activity must be valued. In another moment, the document states that professional qualification permeates policies that aim to define career plans and decent remuneration with the social importance of work. However, this information was omitted in the structuring of resolutions CNE/CP 01 and 02 of 2002, which establish the guidelines.

The DCN/2015 advance by showing a solid concept of valuation, present in both the resolution and the opinion. In this conception, they articulate material issues (salary, career, working conditions) with symbolic issues (initial and continuing education).

It is important to note that Resolution CNE/CP 02 of 2015 deals not only with guidelines for initial formation, but also for continuing education, in addition to pedagogical formation and second teaching degree courses. In addition, the appreciation of teaching professionals receives special attention in chapter VII of the aforementioned resolution. These arguments attest to a solid conception of articulation between formative elements and of material appreciation of the teaching profession.

The 2019 guidelines cite the need for recognition and strengthening of teaching knowledge and practices, and for articulation between formation and valuing the profession. They also return to the PNE when dealing with the importance of salary equivalence between teaching professionals and other professionals with the same qualifications. Despite these considerations, the guidelines fall back when removing the teacher appreciation as one of the structuring axes of the guidelines, present in the DCN/2015.

We show that the DCN/2015 brings a more solid conception of professional appreciation, when dealing with working conditions, career, formation and appreciation in an articulated way. This perspective converges with several authors in the field, such as Diniz-Pereira (2016) and Nóvoa (2017), who underline the need for their articulation. The 2019 DCN, by removing this concept from their texts, articulates with other government movements after 2016, which, as well as the authorization of professionals with “notorious knowledge”, contributed to the devaluation and deprofessionalization of teachers.

Final considerations

In this article, we discuss the trajectory of DCN for teacher formation in Brazil, which begins with the institution of the first guidelines for teaching degrees in 2002. The consolidation of the mandatory practice as a curricular component and supervised internships signaled the need for materialization specificity of teacher formation courses. According to Gatti *et al.* (2019), these DCN marked a moment of possibilities for teacher formation. According to Freitas (2002), despite these advances, these guidelines did not dialogue with demands from the field. The centralization of competences, the reduced minimum time to complete the course (three years) and the reduction of the teaching function to care for learning, attest to a simplified and technicist conception of teaching, built on a light formation.

The Lula and Dilma governments advanced towards overcoming these perspectives over the 14 years of a more organic trajectory in the field. The DCN/2015 were based on more critical ideas, comprising teachers as subjects “formative of knowledge and culture”, with “ethical and political values”. They guided a conception of professional appreciation that articulated initial and continued formation with working and career conditions, as well as defended by authors such as Diniz-Pereira (2015) and Nóvoa (2017). In addition, the number of hours (3,200 hours) and the minimum time to complete the courses (four years) increased. The trajectory of these policies signaled a path to criticality, autonomy and new possibilities for teaching degree courses.

This trajectory does not, however, reveal linearity. The end of the Dilma government, marked by a parliamentary coup (BASTOS, 2017), opened space for a new cycle. Dourado and Siqueira (2019) comprise a “counter-reform, quite conservative and privatist, in the field of education” during the Temer government. The resulting policies have aggravated the process of devaluation and weakening of the professional status of teaching.

DCN/2019, already under the Bolsonaro government, seems to aggravate this political-ideological cycle. Resuming issues overcome by the guidelines of 2015, they reconnected with the concepts in force in 2002, such as the centralization of formation in skills, a critical emptying and the possibility of lightening of formation, due to the non-specification of a minimum time for the completion of courses. Another significant setback concerns the removal of the articulated idea of professional appreciation, in addition to the reduction of the relevance given to continuing education.

Diniz-Pereira (2015) points to a possible consensus in the literature regarding the need to overcome the hegemonic technical model in teaching degree courses. Likewise, we agree with Nóvoa (2017) when the author defends the need to transform teacher formation. The 2019 DCN do not seem to contribute to a transformation towards the ideas defended by academics and entities in the field. And how could they contribute to overcoming secular traditions if they take up conservative ideas? The post-coup transformations seem to narrow the possibilities towards the maintenance of a process of deprofessionalization of teaching.

The ways in which these guidelines materialize are not yet known. Implementation studies of the new DCN/2019 will be necessary to understand the interpretations and actions of the educators in relation to them, as well as their interactions with the implementation process of the DCN/2015. With the publication of Opinion CNE/CP no. 14, of July 2020, which provides for specific guidelines for the continuing education of teachers, new elements may be incorporated into the trajectory of teacher education.

REFERENCES

BASTOS, P. Ascensão e crise do governo Dilma Rousseff e o golpe de 2016: poder estrutura, contradição e ideologia. **Rev. Econ. Contemp.**, n. especial, p. 1-63, 2017.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 009, de 08 de maio de 2001. Dispõe sobre as Diretrizes para a Formação de Professores da Educação Básica, em nível superior, cursos de licenciatura, de graduação plena. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 31, 18 abr. 2002.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 14, de 10 jul. 2020. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Continuada de Professores da Educação Básica e Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Continuada de Professores da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 57, 26 out. 2020.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 2, de 09 junho de 2015. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial e Continuada dos Profissionais do Magistério da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 13, 25 jun. 2015.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 22, de 07 nov. 2019. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 142, 20 dez. 2019.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CES 246, de 04 de maio de 2016. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial e Continuada em Nível Superior para Funcionários da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, p. 49, DF, 12 maio 2016.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 1, de 18 de fevereiro de 2002. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação de Professores da Educação Básica, em nível superior, curso de licenciatura, de graduação plena. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 31, 09 abr. 2002.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 1, de 9 de agosto de 2017. Altera o Art. 22 da Resolução CNE/CP nº 2, de 1º de 2015. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 26, 10 ago. 2017.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 2, de 1 de julho de 2015. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a formação inicial em nível superior e formação continuada. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 8-12, 02 jul. 2015.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 2, de 19 de fevereiro de 2002. Institui a duração e a carga horária dos cursos de licenciatura. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 09, 04 mar. 2002.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 2, de 20 de dezembro de 2019. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 46-49, 20 dez. 2019.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 2, de 22 de dezembro DE 2017. Institui e orienta a implantação da Base Nacional Comum Curricular da Educação Básica. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 41-44, 22 dez. 2017.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP 3, de 3 de outubro de 2018. Altera o Art. 22 da Resolução CNE/CP nº 2, de 1º de 2015. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 21, 04 out. 2018.

BRASIL. Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, n. 248, p. 27833, 23 dez. 1996. PL 1258/1988.

COSTA, C. **O Tema da Qualidade no Plano Nacional de Educação (2014-2024)**. 2016. 96 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2016.

DINIZ-PEREIRA, J. Formação de professores da Educação Básica no Brasil no limiar dos 20 anos da LDBEN. **Notandum**, v. 42, p. 139-160, set./dez. 2016.

DINIZ-PEREIRA, J. Formação de professores, trabalho e saberes docentes. **Trabalho & Educação**, Belo Horizonte, v. 24, n. 3, p. 143-152, set./dez. 2015.

DOURADO, L. Valorização dos profissionais da educação: desafios para garantir conquistas da democracia. **Revista Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, v. 10, n. 18, p. 37-56, jan./jun. 2016.

DOURADO, L.; SIQUEIRA, R. A arte do disfarce: BNCC como gestão e regulação do currículo. **RBP**, v. 35, n. 2, p. 291-306, maio/ago. 2019.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Discurso e mudança social**. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2001.

FREITAS, H. Formação de professores no Brasil: 10 anos de embate entre projetos de formação. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 23, n. 80, p. 136-167, set. 2002.

GATTI, B. *et al.* A trajetória das políticas em formação de professores e professoras, em: **Professores do Brasil: novos cenários de formação**. Brasília: UNESCO, 2019. p. 45-78.

NÓVOA, A. Firmar a posição como professor, afirmar a profissão docente. **Cadernos de Pesquisa** v. 47, n. 166, p. 1106-1133, out./dez. 2017.

OLIVEIRA, B. R. A implementação de políticas educacionais no nível micro: uma análise a partir dos profissionais da escola no contexto da prática. **Revista de Estudos Teóricos y Epistemológicos en Política Educativa**, v. 4, p. 1-17, 2019.

OLIVEIRA, B. R. *et al.* Política de formação de professores nas últimas décadas no Brasil: avanços, desafios, possibilidades e retrocessos. **Roteiro**, Joaçaba, Edição Especial, p. 47-76, dez. 2018.

ROLDÃO, M. Profissionalidade docente em análise: especificidades docentes do ensino superior e não superior. **Nuances: estudos sobre educação**, ano XI, v. 12, n. 13, jan./dez. 2005.

SCHEIBE, L.; BAZZO, V. Formação de professores da educação básica no ensino superior: diretrizes curriculares pós 1996. **Revista Internacional de Educação Superior**, Campinas, v. 2, n. 2, p. 241-256, maio/ago. 2016.

SHIROMA, E.; CAMPOS, R.; GARCIA, R. Decifrar textos para compreender a política: subsídios teórico-metodológicos para análise de documentos. **Perspectiva**, Florianópolis, v. 23, n. 02, p. 427-446, jul./dez. 2005.

TARDIF, M. Saberes profissionais dos professores e conhecimentos universitários Elementos para uma epistemologia da prática profissional dos professores e suas conseqüências em relação à formação para o magistério. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, n. 13, jan./abr. 2000.

How to reference this article

FICHTER FILHO, G. A.; OLIVEIRA, B. R.; COELHO, J. I. F. The trajectory of national curriculum guidelines for teacher formation in Brazil: an analysis from official texts. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. esp. 1, p. 938-953, mar. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16iEsp.1.14930>

Submitted: 20/06/2020

Required revisions: 16/09/2020

Accepted: 03/11/2020

Published: 01/03/2021