

ANALYSIS OF THE SCHOLAR INCLUSION POLICY IN MUNICIPALITY IN TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE

ANÁLISE DA POLÍTICA DE INCLUSÃO ESCOLAR EM UM MUNÍCIPIO NA PERSPECTIVA DE PROFESSORES

ANÁLISIS DE LA POLÍTICA DE INCLUSIÓN ESCOLAR EN UN MUNICIPIO DESDE LA PERSPECTIVA DEL PROFESOR

Vivian SANTOS¹
Enicéia Gonçalves MENDES²

ABSTRACT: In Brazil, the schooling policy for students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in general education system began more than two decades ago, resulting in the expansion of enrollments. However, it is still far from guaranteeing access to the curriculum. The emerging question is how to evaluate and monitor the school inclusion policy to ascertain whether the results point to advances in the right to education provided for SEN students? The present study, based on the theoretical methodological framework of the Policy Cycle Approach, aimed to analyze the context of influence and practice and offer subsidies to address the school inclusion policy of a municipality. The methodology, a multimethod type, involved the participation of 46 teachers from seven schools, with techniques of document analysis, collective interview and with structured questionnaire. The results allowed generating 43 indicators, distributed in 13 items, and in the set of 7 schools, and seven items well evaluated, four resulted in regular indexes and two items considered weak. Different effects of the policy of the same municipality were evident in the seven schools and allowed to point out aspects in which the quality of the policy can improve.

KEYWORDS: Special education. School inclusion. Policy cycle.

RESUMO: No Brasil, a política de escolarização dos estudantes Público-Alvo da Educação Especial (PAEE) no sistema educacional geral iniciou-se há mais de duas décadas, resultando na ampliação de matrículas, mas ainda está longe de garantir acesso ao currículo. A questão emergente é: como avaliar e monitorar a política de inclusão escolar para averiguar se os resultados apontam ou não para avanços do direito à educação provida para alunos PAEE? O presente estudo, baseado no referencial teórico metodológico da Abordagem do Ciclo de Políticas, objetivou analisar o contexto de influência e de prática e oferecer subsídios para melhor equacionar a política de inclusão escolar de um município. A metodologia, do tipo multimétodo, envolveu a participação de 46 professores de sete escolas,

¹ Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCAR), São Carlos – SP – Brazil. Doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Special Education. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7694-4890>. E-mail: vivi.eesp@gmail.com

² Federal university of São Carlos (UFSCAR), São Carlos – SP – Brazil. Full Professor at the Department of Psychology. Doctorate in Psychology (USP). CNPq Research Productivity Scholarship - Level 1B. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3673-0681>. E-mail: egmendes@ufscar.br

com técnicas de análise documental, entrevista coletiva e questionário fechado. Os resultados permitiram gerar 43 indicadores, distribuídos em 13 quesitos, e, no conjunto das sete escolas, com sete quesitos bem avaliados, quatro com índices regulares e dois considerados fracos. No conjunto evidenciou-se diferentes efeitos da política de um mesmo município nas sete escolas e permitiu-se apontar aspectos nos quais a qualidade da política pode melhorar.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Educação especial. Inclusão escolar. Ciclo de políticas.*

RESUMEN: *En Brasil, la política de escolarización para estudiantes con Necesidades Educativas Especiales (NEE) en el sistema de educación general comenzó hace más de dos décadas, lo que resultó en la expansión de la matrícula, pero aún está lejos de garantizar el acceso al plan de estudios. La pregunta emergente es ¿cómo evaluar y monitorear la política de inclusión escolar para determinar si los resultados apuntan o no a avances en el derecho a la educación brindado a los estudiantes con NEE? El presente estudio, basado en el marco teórico metodológico del Enfoque de Ciclo de Políticas, tuvo como objetivo analizar el contexto de influencia y práctica y ofrecer subsidios para mejorar la política de inclusión escolar de un municipio. La metodología, de tipo multimétodo, contó con la participación de 46 docentes de siete escuelas, con técnicas de análisis documental, entrevista colectiva y con cuestionario cerrado. Los resultados permitieron generar 43 indicadores, distribuidos en 13 ítems, y en el conjunto de siete escuelas, con siete ítems bien evaluados, cuatro con índices regulares y dos considerados débiles. En su conjunto, los diferentes efectos de la política de un mismo municipio se evidenciaron en las siete escuelas y permitieron señalar aspectos en los que la calidad de la política puede mejorar.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Educación especial. Inclusión escolar. Ciclo de políticas.*

Introduction

The design traced by a given policy is the way in which society seeks to define its lines of action based on its ethical values (BALL, 1990). In the policy of schooling students with Special Educational Needs (SEN), in the world context, there was a time when these people were not even considered educable. Later, when schools became popular, they gained the opportunity to enter, but in contexts separate from special schools and institutions. And it was only after the 1970s that their schooling in regular schools began to be considered worldwide. These influences from the international context also affect Brazil, having different impacts in a country with continental dimensions, with 26 state education systems, plus the Federal District system, in addition to the 5,570 different realities in the municipalities.

Larner and Laurie (2010) study how multiple actors, geographies and translations are involved in policy transfer processes, which they call “glocalization”, the interplays between

global forms and local circumstances. In this sense, Ball (2005) points out political elements as influencing factors in the political situation, such as: a) neoliberalism with market idealism; b) the new governance networks; c) performativity and; d) the new form of public management, which incorporates specific procedures from the private sector, the cult of excellence and quality. Thus, the macroprocesses through which the expansion of the market, of ways of life, the cultural changes implied by the logic of new forms of accumulation, distribution and circulation of capital, have a strong impact on the governance of countries, states and municipalities on the new needs of legitimize the processes of micro contexts in the daily life of institutions (BALL, 2014).

In Brazil, the defense of SEN students' schooling in the general educational system will appear as a combination of forces between national movements of people with disabilities and the influence of international conventions, promoted by multilateral organizations that forged educational reforms in the 1990s. However, it was from 2003, and in the wake of the reorientation of educational policies with new changes in legislation from basic to higher education (DOURADO, 2007), that programs and actions emerged that aimed to expand access to schooling in common classes from regular schools to SEN students. Since then, there has been an increase in the number of SEN students enrolled in regular classes throughout the country, which increased from 110,536 in 2002 to 1,090,805 in 2019 (INEP, 2002; 2019).

Law 13,005/2014, which approved the National Education Plan (PNE. Portuguese initials), announced in Goal 4 the need to universalize access to schools and Specialized Educational Assistance (SEA) for SEN students in the next 10 years, recognizing that the country still needed to ensure school and teaching quality to this portion of the population. The PNE also predicted that the government would seek to expand the scope of research on the profile of populations aged four to 17, with disabilities, to assess and monitor the established goals (BRASIL, 2014).

However, in the specific case of goal 4, which concerns Special Education, quantitative indicators do not allow to monitor the evolution of the right to education of SEN students, given that many students do not even participate in large-scale assessments conducted in the country (MENDES; CIA; TANNÚS-VALADÃO, 2015), in addition to the SEN identification processes in education systems are still precarious (SANTOS, 2017).

Thus, the question that arises is how to evaluate and monitor the school inclusion policy to determine whether or not the results point to advances in the right to education for

SEN students, and this study focuses on this issue, having as an analytical reference the Policy Cycle Approach (PCA) (BOWE; BALL; GOLD, 1992) and Policy Action Theory (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2016).

The PCA consists of a theoretical-methodological tool for studies on educational policies (MAINARDES; MARCONDES, 2009), which proposes the study of a continuous cycle composed of three interrelated contexts: influence, text production and practice. The three contexts do not have a sequence of linear steps, temporal or sequential dimension (BOWE; BALL; GOLD, 1992).

The context of influence is the space where public policy begins, or the space where political discourses are constructed and key concepts are defined. The text production context involves official documents, formal or informal comments that aim to make sense of official texts. The answers to the texts are given through the third context, of practice, in which the policy is not simply implemented, but rather interpreted and recreated by actors in the school space (BOWE; BALL; GOLD, 1992).

The Theory of Action suggests taking into account the contextual dimensions of policy in four dimensions: situated contexts, professional cultures, material contexts and external contexts (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2016). In the contexts situated, the way in which members of the school body constructed a vision of the schools in question is considered. Professional cultures are about how professionals are connected to a team and how each person's role impacts their understanding of politics. Material contexts are the physical aspects of schools, their staff and infrastructure. Finally, external contexts include pressures from external evaluations and expectations regarding a particular school and the work performed by its professionals (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2016).

The present study aims to analyze the school inclusion policy of a municipality based on the perceptions of teachers in regular education, focusing on elements of the context of influence and practice, in addition to producing subsidies to better equate the policy analyzed in the investigated municipality.

Methodology

The study involved a multi-method or mixed design (YIN, 2010), and was developed in a municipal network of a small city in the interior of the state of São Paulo, with an estimated population of about 59 thousand inhabitants in 2016 (SEADE, 2017). The study

was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (CEP) of the Federal University of São Carlos (CAAE number: 68140317.9.0000.5504).

The design involved the study of official documents of the municipality, interviews with two people indicated as being of reference in the historical process of the Special Education policy, analysis of statistical indicators of SEN student enrollments, application of a structured questionnaire with regular education teachers, in addition to a press conference with the group of participating teachers. Forty-six teachers participated in the study, most of whom had a degree (98%), 14 (30%) had a specialization in the area of Special Education, 41 (89%) taught in the early years of elementary school, four (9 %) in the final years, and only one (2%) in preschool.

The instrument used was the “School Inclusion Policy Analysis Questionnaire – Teachers of Common Education – QUAPOIE-PEC, third version” (LACERDA; MENDES, 2016), consisting of 292 items, classified into 13 items and 42 indicators. The questionnaire items were grouped into indicators, and these were aggregated to compose the items. Indicators and questions could reach minimum values from 0 to maximum 10, and proportional weighted values were assigned to the answer alternatives for each item, and to each item, depending on its relevance to the composition of that indicator. From the total values of the indicators, the averages for the item were obtained. Qualitative data were collected through collective interviews with audio recording, later transcribed to complement the analysis of quantitative data.

For this study, due to the need for delimitation, analyzes of data obtained from teachers through questionnaires were prioritized, and eventually, reference is made to statistical data, documents and interviews with managers, in order to better contextualize the analysis of indicators.

The Municipality's Special Education Policy

The municipality studied was founded at the end of the 16th century, where there were a large number of farms, and a village was established in the area around 1800, taking around 75 years for it to become a city (IBGE, 2019). In 2018, it had an estimated population of approximately 60,000 inhabitants.

The creation of the specialized institution of the Association of Parents and Friends of the Exceptional (APAE, Portuguese initials), in the early 1970s, coincides with the first initiatives of the federal government on Special Education policy in the country (LAPLANE;

CAIADO; KASSAR, 2016). This institutionalization policy was maintained from the 1970s to the mid-1990s, and at the same time special classes were created in the municipality's state schools.

It was only in 1996 that the municipality had its first initiative to insert students with disabilities into the municipal network, a move that coincides with the process of municipalization of elementary education. At the time, a support service from a multidisciplinary team from the specialized institution, in partnership with the municipality, began to be offered to schools with SEN student enrollments.

In 2005, with a new change in municipal management, this support service was taken over by the municipal government, and the idea that the best place for schooling would be the common class also arrived in the local context, as a reflection of what was propagated in the national context (BRASIL, 2004; MENDES, 2006).

In 2008, the municipality adhered to the federal government's policy proposal, giving centrality to the SEA services, transforming the former special classes into Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRR), and maintaining a resource room for students with visual impairments. According to data from the school census, there were around 30 SEN students in municipal schools, before starting the school inclusion policy. Between 2008 and 2010, this number rose to around 70 students. From 2010 to 2013 enrollments continued to increase, and from 2013, contrary to what is observed in the country, there is a continuous decrease in the number of enrollments of these students in the common classes in the municipality. This decrease was explained by the management as a result of the adoption of stricter criteria in the identification of SEN students.

In 2018, the year this study began, the institution of APAE provided specialized care to students with intellectual disabilities classified as "moderate" to "severe", who did not attend regular schools. The configuration of support in the municipal network involved the SEA in the MRR. In addition, indirect services were offered by the multidisciplinary team, which at the time offered continuing education and projects with specific focuses.

The study was carried out in 2018 and 2019, in seven municipal schools with enrollments of SEN students, called E1 to E7. E2 was the school that had the largest number of SEN students (17), followed by E3 (11), E6 and E1 (8), E5 and E7 (7). Regarding gender, there was a predominance of male SEN students in all schools studied, with proportions ranging from 53% (E2) to 100% (E4). Regarding the SEN category, there was a predominance of students with intellectual disabilities (37 students). Autism Spectrum

Disorder was the category with the second highest incidence (15), followed by physical impairment (9) and hearing (8), low vision (4), multiple disability (2).

Quality of school inclusion policy in the municipality based on indicators in the assessment of teachers

The analysis of the results of the questionnaires resulted in 42 indicators, distributed in 13 items. The indicators and questions could reach values between zero and ten, and were classified as follows, for interpretation purposes: scores between 0 and 2.0 were classified as insufficient; 2.01 and 4.00 as weak; 4.01 and 6.0 as regular; 6.01 and 8.00 as good and 8.01 and 10 as very good. The results obtained for indicators and questions in the schools studied are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 – List of indices obtained in the indicators by school

	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	M.
I 1	7,67 - B	7,33 - B	8,00 - B	8,00 - B	8,00 - B	7, 20 - B	8,00 - B	7,67 - B
I 2	5,50 - R	6,90 - B	6,14 - B	5,00 - R	7,30 - B	3, 20 - F	6, 25 - B	4,54 - R
Overall average for item I - Education: 6.75 - B								
I 3	7,67 - B	7,33 - B	8,00 - B	8,00 - B	8,00 - B	7, 20 - B	8,00 - B	7,67 - B
Overall average for item II - Working conditions: 8.34 - B								
I 4	3,67 - F	3,42 - F	5,57 - R	5,60 - R	5,00 - R	4,67 - R	6,75 - B	4,67 - R
I 5	8,60 - MB	7,10 - B	8,86 - MB	8,40 - MB	8,83 - MB	8,00 - B	10,00 - MB	8,35 - MB
Overall average for item III - School organization: 6.75 - B								
I 6	4,08 - R	5,00 - R	2,81 - F	3,60 - F	4,33 - R	3,75 - F	4,67 - R	4,12 - R
Overall average for item IV - Identification of SEN: 4.03 - R								
I 7	10,00 - MB	9,88 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	9,67 - MB	10,00 - MB	9,92 - MB
I 8	10,00 - MB	9,88 - MB	9,90 - MB	9,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	8,67 - MB	9,17 - MB	9,57 - MB
I 9	10,00 - MB	9,94 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	9,98 - MB
I 10	9,17 - MB	8,91 - MB	10,00 - MB	6,00 - R	7,50 - B	8,00 - B	10,00 - MB	8,63 - MB
Overall average for item V – Personal support for the SEN student: 9.49 - MB								
I 11	8,67 - MB	6,83 - B	8,57 - MB	8,80 - MB	6,17 - B	8,17 - MB	9,00 - MB	7,83 - B
I 12	7,33 - B	5,58 - R	5,14 - R	4,00 - F	4,83 - R	5,17 - R	6,00 - R	5,46 - R
I 13	1,67 - I	0,83 - I	1,43 - I	2,00 - I	0,83 - I	0,83 - I	0,00 - I	1,09 - I
I 14	6,00 - R	2,08 - F	2,14 - F	1,00 - I	0,00 - I	2,50 - F	1, 25 - I	2, 20 - F
I 15	0,83 - I	3,58 - F	4, 29 - R	4,40 - R	0,00 - I	2,83 - F	4,00 - F	2,89 - F
I 16	0,00 - I	2,08 - F	2, 29 - F	2, 20 - F	2,50 - F	3,50 - F	0,00 - I	1,91 - I
Overall average for item VI - Pedagogical supports for the SEN student: 3.56 - F								
I 17	10,00 - MB	8,33 - MB	10,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	9,17 - MB	5,83 - R	8,75 - MB	8,80 - MB
I 18	4,67 - R	5,08 - R	5,40 - R	4,00 - F	5,83 - R	1,50 - I	2,50 - F	4,13 - R
Overall average for item VII - Democratic Management: 6.46 - B								
I 19	5,33 - R	5,58 - R	9,00 - MB	5,00 - R	5,83 - R	5,17 - R	7,00 - B	5,83 - R
I 20	4,50 - R	3,58 - F	5,57 - R	5, 20 - R	5,00 - R	1,67 - I	3,75 - F	4,13 - R
Overall average for item VIII - Planning: 4.98 - R								
I 21	8,00 - B	6,50 - B	6,71 - B	8, 20 - MB	7,33 - B	6,50 - B	7, 25 - B	7,09 - B
I 22	4,33 - R	2,08 - F	4, 29 - R	3,00 - F	4,17 - R	1,17 - I	2,50 - F	3,00 - F
I 23	5,33 - R	5,00 - R	5,71 - R	6,60 - B	5,67 - R	6,00 - R	4,75 - R	5,52 - R
I 24	4,50 - R	4,42 - R	4, 29 - R	4, 20 - R	5,00 - R	3,50 - F	5,50 - R	4,43 - R
I 25	3,50 - F	2,42 - F	1,43 - I	1, 20 - I	4,00 - F	1,33 - I	2,50 - F	2,35 - F
Overall average of item IX - Teaching strategies: 4.54 - R								
I 26	4,17 - R	3,50 - F	6,43 - B	4,00 - F	4,33 - R	2,33 - F	1, 25 - I	3,85 - F
I 27	8,00 - B	5,67 - R	4,71 - R	9, 20 - MB	8,67 - MB	6,17 - B	6, 25 - B	6,72 - B
I 28	7,00 - B	4,83 - R	6,86 - B	9, 20 - MB	6,67 - B	4,00 - F	3,50 - F	5,91 - R
I 29	6,17 - B	4,50 - R	6,43 - B	5,00 - R	6,67 - B	6,83 - B	2,75 - F	5,50 - R
I 30	8,50 - MB	7,58 - B	6,57 - B	8,00 - B	9,33 - MB	5,17 - R	6,75 - B	7,43 - B
I 31	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,00 - I

Overall average for item X - Assessment of teaching and learning of SEN students: 4.90 - R									
I 32	0,83 - I	0,92 - I	0,14 - I	0,80 - I	2,00 - I	0,17 - I	0,25 - I	0,76 - I	
I 33	8,17 - MB	6,67 - B	7,00 - B	6,60 - B	8,33 - MB	5,67 - R	8,25 - MB	7,13 - B	
I 34	7,67 - B	5,92 - R	6,71 - B	7,40 - B	5,50 - R	5,50 - R	7,75 - B	6,48 - B	
I 35	9,33 - MB	9,42 - MB	10,00 - MB	9,00 - MB	10,00 - MB	8,83 - MB	9,50 - MB	9,46 - MB	
I 36	2,67 - F	1,67 - I	1,00 - I	1,60 - I	4,17 - R	2,17 - F	4,50 - R	2,33 - F	
I 37	6,00 - R	5,00 - R	4,71 - R	8,00 - B	5,33 - R	7,33 - B	8,75 - MB	6,09 - R	
Overall average for item XI - Interactions: 6.46 - B									
I 38	9,33 - MB	8,42 - MB	8,14 - MB	8,20 - MB	9,67 - MB	8,50 - MB	9,50 - MB	8,74 - MB	
Overall average for item XII - Attitudes towards school inclusion: 8.82 - MB									
I 39	3,83 - F	1,50 - I	2,86 - F	3,80 - F	4,67 - R	4,33 - R	2,50 - F	3,13 - F	
I 40	2,67 - F	3,67 - F	2,71 - F	4,20 - R	4,67 - R	3,67 - F	4,25 - R	3,63 - F	
I 41	5,50 - R	6,67 - B	5,57 - R	7,40 - B	6,50 - B	7,00 - B	5,75 - R	6,37 - B	
I 42	0,00 - I	0,33 - I	0,29 - I	0,00 - I	0,33 - I	1,00 - I	0,00 - I	0,30 - I	
Overall average for item XIII - Sense of self-efficacy: 3.42 - F									

Source: Data obtained in the analysis of the QUAPOIE-C questionnaires

The general indexes reached by the 13 items, in the set of seven schools, showed that two of them (15%) were evaluated as very good, the Item V - Personal support for the SEN student (9.49) and the Item XII - Attitudes in relation to school inclusion (8.82). Five items (38%) had indexes considered good (38%), namely, Item I - Education (6.75), Item II - Working conditions (8.34), Item III - School organization (6.75), Item VII - Democratic Management (6.46), and Item XI - Interactions (6.46). Four of the items resulted in indices considered regular (31%): Item IV - Identification of SEN (4.03), Item VIII - Planning (4.98), Item IX - Teaching strategies (4.54), and Item X - Assessment of the teaching and learning of SEN students (4.90). Finally, two items (15%) resulted in indexes considered to be weak, which were: Item VI - pedagogical supports for SEN students (3.56) and Item XIII - Regent teachers' sense of self-efficacy in relation to teaching SEN students (3.42).

In relation to schools, considering the 42 indicators analyzed, it was found that the proportion of indices considered very good or good ranged from 48% (E3 and E7) to 36% (E6). On the other hand, the proportion of indicators considered weak or insufficient ranged from 46% (E6) to 19% (E5). These results indicate that between 1/5 to 1/2 of the 42 indicators were considered weak or insufficient, indicating that there are many points to be improved in the municipal policy. In addition, it is clear that the indicators of E1, E3 and E5 were better evaluated, while E2 and E6 had a higher proportion of weak and insufficient indicators and a lower proportion of good or very good indicators, which shows that policies produce different in effects in different schools. Next, some indicators of the items will be detailed, especially those considered weak or regular, which pointed to aspects that needed improvement in the municipality's school inclusion policy.

In Item VI (pedagogical support for SEN students) the existence of a support network for SEN students was considered ideal, counting on the existence of SEA, performed at the

MRR or at the Educational Service Center. As for the other supports, it was also considered the existence of support professionals, pedagogical support (school reinforcement), Special Education teachers working in the itinerant modality, the existence of assistance in the classroom (collaborative teaching or dual teaching) and assistance by the team multidisciplinary. The degree of satisfaction of teachers with all these types of support services listed was also scored.

It is noteworthy that the SEA service (indicator 11) was well evaluated in all seven schools, evidencing the satisfaction of the regent teachers, although this did not always necessarily occur after school hours. The teachers explained that the network had a considerable number of students who lived in the rural area, who depended on public transport with a fixed schedule, which implied the provision of SEA in the same shift so that they could benefit from the service, a similar reality found in studies on other Brazilian municipalities (ANACHE *et al.*, 2014).

Regarding the pedagogical support service for specialized teachers in the common room (indicator 13), only a small portion of the teachers recognized the existence of this service. In the focus group, it was found that, despite the intentions expressed in various official documents, the municipality still did not systematically offer specialized teacher support in the common class.

Regarding the pedagogical support of itinerant teachers (indicator 14), although it was appointed by the management, and was also mentioned in official documents, only part of the teachers reported that this service was offered in their respective schools, which indicates that or the service was unsystematic, or was not perceived or understood by teachers.

Regarding the pedagogical support service (indicator 15) or school support for students with academic difficulties, which, although not exclusive to SEN students, constituted yet another support option and allowed to reduce the demand for the SEA, it was also found that it was the SEA teachers who also assisted the “support students”. Participants from all schools, except E5, confirmed the existence of this service and, according to the manager, since the municipality had been adopting stricter criteria in the identification process, the number of students considered with SEN had decreased. Thus, in order not to close down services or reduce the workload of specialized teachers, they also assumed the support service for students with academic difficulties.

As for the service of support professionals, hired to provide support for the personal needs of SEN students (locomotion, food, hygiene and communication), the teachers reported

that the frequency required for this type of service was low, and other teachers were unaware of the presence of these professionals in the education network, which indicates that the presence of students with multiple and more severe levels of impairment was small. It is noteworthy that the municipality also hired trainees from the Teaching Degree in Pedagogy course to support students in the classroom.

Finally, regarding the other services provided by professionals from the multidisciplinary team, only about 30% of the teachers were aware of the existence of this service in the network, and none of the teachers in schools E1 and E7 reported that their school had this type of support. Most teachers who signaled awareness of this service rated it negatively. Thus, although the municipality had a multidisciplinary team available to the network for over 10 years, it seems that the service required revision to achieve greater visibility and efficiency.

In summary, it was observed that in Item VI (pedagogical support for SEN student), what impacted them was not the assessment of the SEA in MRR, but the other services (pedagogical support, co-teaching or dual teaching, itinerant service, professional support and multidisciplinary team), which were considered by teachers as insufficient or inefficient. Thus, although the municipality provided the organization of a network of support services with a diversified offer of support, in addition to the SEA in MRR, the structuring and integration of services, the coverage of all schools, as well as their visibility and efficiency, still seemed like a goal to be achieved.

The second item evaluated as critical was related to the “Sense of self-efficacy³ (Item XIII). This item aimed to assess the degree of knowledge, self-assessment of the teaching work and formative demands. Indicator 39 questioned the level of knowledge of the teacher in relation to the pedagogical needs of their students as a whole, and of their SEN students in particular. Indicator 40 was about the level of knowledge of the teacher in relation to: a) the procedures/materials/didactic resources and equipment/technological resources that met the pedagogical needs of their SEN students; b) the legislation that made up the school inclusion policy; c) the rights and duties of the teacher while in the common class with SEN students; and d) the rights of SEN students. Indicator 41 asked teachers about the self-assessment of their differences in pedagogical practices to respond to the needs of their SEN students and

³ Self-efficacy is understood as being “[...] a judgment that the teacher makes about their own abilities to achieve desired results of student engagement and learning, even among those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (TSCHANNEN-MORAN; WOOLFOLK-HOY, 2001, p. 783, our translation).

the management of prejudice relationships in schools. Finally, indicator 42 evaluated the formative demands of teachers, and included the same items as the previous indicator, hoping, however, that the teacher would not point out training demands on the themes.

In this regard, the only indicator that presented results classified as good was related to teacher self-assessment (I41). Indicators 41 and 42 are complementary, since if the teacher indicated having knowledge, he/she should also indicate not needing formation on this subject, and the results of the regent teachers were coherent, that is, the greater the knowledge, the lower the index of formative need.

The sense of self-efficacy is one of the factors that determine the teachers' conceptions regarding the ability to teach their students (CASANOVA; AZZI, 2015), which indicates that the low rates obtained in this item as a whole can understand problems related to teaching practice, as expressed by the common class teachers during the focus group:

[...] I think it's frustrating, I can't deal with the difficulty, they need help. I don't have the competence or ability to do this (P17 report, regular class teacher).

[...] I searched, but even so I couldn't help... there's no way" (P3 report, regular class teacher).

[...] until we understand how the child is, what his difficulty is, the path you will be able to reach him... it is painful. Because you want to help, you want to do it, but at the same time you feel powerless, then we are looking for help from the person who is not feeling the same situation as us, so I feel difficulty, I am not happy working with inclusion. I think I'm not prepared for that situation, I suffer a lot from it. (P3 report, teacher, our translation).

It is also worth mentioning that the statements about self-assessment portray the differences in the professional cultures of the schools, as the teachers positively evaluated their own work with the other students, but none of them positively evaluated their work with the SEN students (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2016).

In addition to the two items described that were considered most critical, four other items were assessed as regular, and their indicators will be analyzed to point out other points that could improve the quality of the municipality's policy, namely: Item IV – Identification of SEN (4, 03), item IX - Teaching Strategies (4.54), Item X - Assessment of teaching and learning of SEN students (4.90) and Item VIII - Planning (4.98).

Item IV analyzed the process of identifying SEN students, consisting of an indicator that was considered ideal for the SEN student to have a clinical report and educational opinion, for the teacher to have access to the individualized educational plan or similar document for the student, and for there to be as many members as possible participating in the

identification process, in order to minimize possible biases. All schools had scores between weak and regular, a result that demonstrates that, although SEN students have identification, this occurred in a non-participatory way, as students were either identified by medical evaluation, or teacher evaluation, but in most cases, by the specialized philanthropic institution in partnership with the municipality. In general, the identification was carried out by health professionals, it did not involve school professionals, and although it allowed for a certain homogeneity in the criteria, important information was not provided for teachers who would work with the students.

Item IX was about pedagogical practice, and consisted of five indicators. In indicator 21, SEN students were expected to participate in all activities in the common room, with differences in the pedagogical practices of teachers when necessary, and that this was planned with the support of the Special Education teacher and evaluated as being satisfactory, for the teacher to interact at times, individually with the SEN students and check if they were doing the activities. The other indicators of this item aimed to verify whether the teacher performed differentiations, when they were necessary for their SEN students, in content, teaching strategies, in teaching materials/resources and in the classroom infrastructure, and also if the teacher of Special Education helped in carrying out these measures.

The data in Table 1 show that, with the exception of schools E2 and E3, the scores obtained in indicator 21 (participation in activities) were considered good, while in the other indicators all scores varied between insufficient and regular. Therefore, these data allowed us to estimate that although students were participating in the activities of the common room, the differences for teaching were not being carried out as necessary, which could directly influence how much these students would have access to the curriculum. The results suggest that the SEN students in the regular class were subjected to the same teaching conditions as the other students, and if they needed some equalization measure to make teaching more effective, these measures were not adopted, possibly because teachers in the common school did not know how to respond to the diversity of these students.

Item VIII analyzed the forms of existing planning aimed at SEN students, consisting of two indicators. For indicator 19, the existence of individualized or similar educational planning meetings for SEN students was considered appropriate, as well as sufficient workload of common room teachers to plan the teaching of SEN students in their respective classes, and that they could count on a satisfactory partnership with the special education teacher. For the second indicator of this item, documented collective curriculum planning

meetings were expected to be held monthly or bimonthly, which should be sufficient to plan teaching for SEN students.

In all, only four teachers, from schools E3, E4, E5 and E7, reported that there were meetings with the Special Education teachers for planning. Part of the other teachers indicated that despite this type of meeting, they did not participate. On the other hand, when asked about the time available in their respective workloads for planning aimed at SEN students, only five teachers from the common class indicated they had enough time for this (one teacher from E2, E4 and E5 and two from E3).

The data about planning reflect the importance of a multidimensional reading in the analysis of educational policies, as this makes it possible to understand that the performance of the policy is also a reflection of the material contexts, that is, the investments in the human resources of these schools, or the lack of them. Ball (2016) explains that the more distant a text is from the school reality, the more complex its performance will be, and the inequalities of the local context influence this performance.

The lack of time for planning activities for SEN students explains the low level of differentiation in teaching by the regent teachers:

[...] there is one that has a report and I have 8 that has an absurd difficulty, there is one that I teach him in pre-school, because he doesn't even know the letters. And the rest of the class wanting to read, doing things, so I'm lost, because I think that after so much work, I want to pay attention to them, but I can't, because the class is walking and they ask me for more activity, they finish: 'aunt I'm done, I'm done', and you'll let the class pick a picture, so I choose one a day, out of those 8. So I mean, I don't feel like I'm doing much, but that's it, because the class has to walk (Report of a common class teacher in the focus group, our translation).

These aspects mainly reflect the material contexts, since both the teaching hours, part of the fixed cost of schools through staff salaries, and the availability of resources to work with SEN students in specialized care, are components of budgets of schools, which, as brought up by Ball, Maguire and Braun (2016, p. 54, our translation), “[...] are perhaps the most 'material' of all contextual factors”, in addition to which, in line with this issue, it is noteworthy that decisions about financing can “[...] shape investment decisions in unexpected ways, that so, capital spending becomes less about priorities and more about opportunities”.

Regarding the teaching of SEN students, there is also the data from Item X, on the assessment of teaching and learning of SEN students, consisting of six indicators. It was found that most scores varied in the indicators of this item between regular and insufficient,

demonstrating the lack of adequacy in the assessment of learning of SEN students. It is also important to highlight that indicator 31 had score zero in all schools, since all participating teachers responded that they did not carry out transition plans for any SEN student.

Except for indicators 30 and 31, which showed some consistency between schools, with the first being highly rated, and the second being negatively rated, again a certain discrepancy in the school's indices can be seen, which once again shows how professional cultures vary according to the school, as well as, that the actors interpret differently the city's school inclusion policy, with regard to how the assessment of student performance should be (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2016).

Final considerations

The analysis of the municipality's history highlights moments of intersection and moments of separation between the paths of the Ministry of Education's policy and the Municipal Department of Education. As moments of intersection, the strong brand of the institution specialized in the sector stands out from the beginning, which is consistent with the influences of the international panorama, which leverages this outsourcing in order to save on the role of the State to fund education for the SEN students.

In addition, there are accentuated timings between changes in policy directions in the national and local context, such as the introduction of the inclusion discourse in the mid-1990s, although integration practices continued to take place in the municipality and in the parents. The mid-2000s also saw the radicalization of the inclusive movement in both contexts, and from 2008, when a more consistent policy of the federal government expands funding to make the perspective of inclusive education viable in the country, this has an immediate impact in the municipality as well, which adheres to the creation of the MRRs and expands the number of SEN student enrollments in its schools.

In other aspects, it is clear that the municipality signs its authorship in the construction of the policy when, for example, it maintains other support services, not provided for in the federal policy, and sets up a support network involving teachers in the common class with SEN students, multidisciplinary team services, itinerant education, continuously renewing its partnership with the third sector in order to complement this network, in addition to creating and sustaining a support service for students with difficulties, who are not defined as SEA target audience. However, this seems to be done with resource constraints, so that the impact

ends up causing inequalities in the practice context of the seven schools. Regarding the public-private partnership, contrary to the confrontation that was observed in the national context between the formulators of the inclusive education policy of 2008 and the movement of non-governmental organizations in the sector, it is observed that in the investigated municipality the relationship was always cordial and collaborative.

In the context of practice, this study focused on the municipal network, made up of seven schools with enrollments of students with SEN, seeking to analyze the policy of school inclusion from the perspective of teachers of common education. The techniques used allowed for a comprehensive analysis of various policy topics and showed how the same policy undergoes different translations in the contexts of practice, promotes inequalities, and this has different impacts on the quality of education of SEN students and on social justice that we hope these policies will correct.

From the perspective of teachers from the common class, positive and negative points could be pointed out and allow, if there is interest, to improve the effects of the school inclusion policy. In particular, four aspects are highlighted here, related to the various evidences found and which refer to: teacher formation, the organization of the support system, the role of the school for SEN students and the inequality in the effects of the policy.

Insufficient formation in the area of Special Education, together with the lack of time allocated for collaborative planning between teachers of regular classes and Special Education, may be causing difficulties in terms of pedagogical practices. This can also be seen in the teachers' self-assessment regarding the work performed, as well as in the degree of knowledge and formative demands they present, signaling problems in understanding the policy and in working with SEN students. It is believed that this can be modified from continuing education and material investments to improve the spaces for sharing between teachers and the material resources made available for this purpose.

A second noteworthy aspect is that both the national policy and the municipal policy for school inclusion still conceive disability or difference as the students' personal characteristics, and organizes the support circumscribed in the specialized space of the MRR, while the school changes little to contemplate the diversity of students. Thus, the positive evaluation that teachers make of the support professionals who help them in the daily life of the classroom does not seem to be casual. In this sense, it is defended as essential the need for changes in the support system, so that more support is centered in the context of the common

class and in the school as a whole, and less limited to extra-class care in resource rooms, which could improve the quality of the school inclusion policy.

The third aspect to be highlighted refers to the main function of the school for SEN students, because when considering the data from the indicators on the teaching conditions and assessments of student learning, the assessments were less positive, while the question of interactions and relationships are well evaluated; It can be deduced that the concern of schools with SEN students is still more about socializing and less about providing access to curriculum-based knowledge. Thus, it is necessary to look for ways to, more than welcome, teach these students.

Finally, the fourth aspect highlighted is the unequal effects that the same policy in the context of a municipality causes in different schools, and this poses problems for the management within the policy, which should better consider the diversity in the contexts situated, in the materials, in the professional cultures and in external contexts in order to improve the results of the school inclusion policy within the municipality, aiming to reduce inequalities and injustices.

Finally, based on the study, the municipality now has a diagnosis of its policy, subsidies to improve it, and will be able to monitor and assess its actions in the future towards improving the quality of the school inclusion policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: To FAPESP and CNPq for funding this research.

REFERENCES

ANACHE, A. A.; AGOSTINI, M. F.; BRUNO, M. G. M.; SILVA, A. M. Atendimento Educacional Especializado nas Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais do Estado de Mato Grosso do Sul. *In*: MENDES, E. G.; CIA, F.; D' AFFONSECA, S. M. (Org.). **Inclusão escolar e a avaliação do público-alvo da Educação Especial**. São Carlos: Marquezine & Manzini: ABPEE, 2015. v. 2, p. 279-300.

BALL, S. J. **Educação Global S.A.:** novas redes políticas e o imaginário neoliberal. Trad. Janete Bridon. Ponta Grossa: UEPG, 2014. 270 p.

BALL, S. J.; MAGUIRE, M.; BRAUN, A. **Como as escolas fazem as políticas:** atuação em escolas secundárias. Ponta Grossa: UEPG, 2016.

BOWE, R.; BALL, S. J.; GOLD, A. **Reforming education & changing schools:** case studies in policy sociology. London: Routledge, 1992.

BRASIL. Decreto n. 7.611, de 17 de novembro de 2011. Dispõe sobre a educação especial, o atendimento educacional especializado e dá outras providências. Presidência da República. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 12, 18 nov. 2011.

BRASIL. Lei n. 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação -PNE e dá outras providências. Presidência da República. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 1, 26 jun. 2014. PL 8035/2010

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **O acesso de estudantes com deficiência às escolas e classes comuns da rede regular**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2004.

CASANOVA, D. C. G.; AZZI, R. G. Análise sobre variáveis explicativas da autoeficácia docente. **Educar em Revista**, Curitiba, n. 58, p. 237-252, out./dez. 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.43236>

DOURADO, L. F. Políticas e gestão da educação básica no Brasil: limites e perspectivas. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 28, n. 100, p. 921-946, out. 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302007000300014>

IBGE. **Estimativa Populacional**. 2019. Available: <https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/sp>. Access: 19 Dec. 2019.

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE PESQUISAS EDUCACIONAIS ANÍSIO TEIXEIRA. **Sinopse Estatística da Educação Básica**. Brasília: INEP, 2002.

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE PESQUISAS EDUCACIONAIS ANÍSIO TEIXEIRA. **Sinopse Estatística da Educação Básica**. Brasília: INEP, 2019.

LACERDA, C. B. F.; MENDES, E. G. **A avaliação da qualidade da educação especial no âmbito da Educação Básica** (Processo Inep: 23112.001311/2016-08). Relatório Final. São Carlos, SP: INEP, 2016.

LARNER, W.; LAURIE, N. Travelling technocrats, embodied knowledges: globalising privatisation in telecoms and water. **Geoforum**, v. 41, n. 2, 218-226, mar. 2010.

MAINARDES, J.; MARCONDES, M. I. Entrevista com Stephen J. Ball: um diálogo sobre justiça social, pesquisa e política educacional. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 30, n. 106, jan./abr. 2009.

MENDES, E. G. A radicalização do debate sobre a inclusão escolar no Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Campinas, v. 11, p. 387-405, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782006000300002>

MENDES, E. G.; CIA, F.; TANNÚS-VALADÃO, G. Organização e Funcionamento do Atendimento Educacional Especializado. *In*: MENDES, E. G.; CIA, F.; TANNÚS-VALADÃO, G. (Org.) **Inclusão escolar em Foco**: organização e funcionamento do atendimento educacional especializado. Marília: ABPEE, 2015. p. 25-36.

SANTOS, V. **Análise de indicadores educacionais censitários da política de inclusão escolar**: uma proposta metodológica. 2017. 110 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Especial) –Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2017.

TSCHANNEN-MORAN, M.; WOOLFOLK-HOY, A. Teacher Efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, v. 17, p. 783-805, 2001.

YIN, R. K. **Estudo de caso**: planejamento e métodos. 4. ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2010. 248 p.

How to reference this article

SANTOS, V.; MENDES, E. G. Analysis of the scholar inclusion policy in municipality in teacher's perspective. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. esp. 2, p. 1325-1342, maio 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16iesp2.15128>

Submitted: 15/12/2020

Required revisions: 28/01/2021

Approved: 03/03/2021

Published: 01/05/2021