

INSTRUMENTS FOR EVALUATING INCLUSIVE PRACTICES, CULTURES AND POLICIES IN UNIVERSITY CONTEXTS

INSTRUMENTO PARA AVALIAÇÃO DE PRÁTICAS, CULTURAS E POLÍTICAS INCLUSIVAS EM CONTEXTOS UNIVERSITÁRIOS

INSTRUMENTOS PARA EVALUACIÓN DE PRÁCTICAS, CULTURAS Y POLÍTICAS INCLUSIVAS EN CONTEXTOS UNIVERSITARIOS

Juliana Cavalcante de Andrade LOUZADA¹
Sandra Eli Sartoreto de Oliveira MARTINS²

ABSTRACT: The presence of people with disabilities in higher education shows affirmative policies in defense of a university accessible for all. It also calls on distinguished members of the academic community to reduce inequalities in access and participation in Higher Education, to population groups in a situation of social, economic, and educational vulnerability, including people with disabilities. This research describes the preparation of the instrument to identify inclusive policies, cultures, and practices in university contexts. It is the Inclusion Index for Higher Education (INES), translated and adapted for use in different university socio-educational environments. The results indicated adjustments in the original instrument and created the adapted version to the Brazilian university context. Its applicability reaffirms the institutional commitment of the academic community for a social, critical, and transforming perspective of the training processes in Higher Education

KEYWORDS: Accessibility. Inclusive education. Higher education. Inclusion.

RESUMO: *A presença de pessoas com deficiência no ensino superior acena políticas afirmativas em defesa de uma universidade acessível a todos. Convoca ainda, distintos membros da comunidade acadêmica a reduzir as desigualdades no acesso e participação na Educação Superior, à coletivos populacionais, em situação de vulnerabilidade social, econômica e educacional, dos quais se inserem as pessoas com deficiências. Posto isso, este trabalho descreve a preparação do instrumento de pesquisa para identificar políticas, culturas e práticas inclusivas em contextos universitários. Trata-se do Índice de Inclusão para Educação Superior (INES), traduzido e adaptado para uso em ambientes socioeducativos universitários distintos. Os resultados indicaram ajustes no instrumento original sendo, portanto, adaptado ao contexto universitário brasileiro. Sua aplicabilidade reafirma o compromisso institucional da comunidade acadêmica para uma mirada social, crítica e transformadora dos processos de formativos na Educação Superior.*

¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Education of the Faculty of Philosophy and Sciences (FFC). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8713-8963>. E-mail: ju_louzada@hotmail.com

² São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Assistant Professor at the Department of Special Education and at the Postgraduate Program in Education, Faculty of Philosophy and Sciences (FFC). Doctorate in Education (UNESP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4247-1447>. E-mail: sandra.eli@unesp.br

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Acessibilidade. Educação inclusiva. Ensino superior. Inclusão.*

RESUMEN: *La presencia de personas con discapacidad en la educación superior atrae políticas afirmativas en defensa de una universidad accesible para todos. También hace un llamado a los distinguidos miembros de la comunidad académica para reducir las desigualdades en el acceso y participación en la Educación Superior, de los grupos de población en situación de vulnerabilidad social, económica y educativa, incluidas las personas con discapacidad. Dicho esto, este trabajo describe la elaboración del instrumento de investigación para identificar políticas, culturas y prácticas inclusivas en contextos universitarios. Es el Índice de Inclusión para la Educación Superior (INES), traducido y adaptado para su uso en diferentes entornos socioeducativos universitarios. Los resultados indicaron ajustes en el instrumento original, siendo, por tanto, adaptado al contexto universitario brasileño. Su aplicabilidad reafirma el compromiso institucional de la comunidad académica con una perspectiva social, crítica y transformadora de los procesos de formación en Educación Superior.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Accesibilidad. Educación inclusiva. Enseñanza superior. Inclusión.*

Introduction

The access to education is a fundamental right of everyone, in this sense, strategies for the inclusion of people with disabilities in the educational environment have been gaining space in recent decades. This progress began with some international documents such as: World Declaration on Education for All (UNICEF, 1990), Declaration of Salamanca (UNESCO, 1994) and the Convention of Guatemala (OEA, 1999), but only gained strength in the national scene in 2008 with the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (BRASIL, 2008), being reinforced with the Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of People with Disabilities (BRASIL, 2015).

Given the publication of these documents, it was possible to notice a greater concern of educational institutions facing the inclusion and accessibility policies in the educational space.

When we talk about accessibility, we mean:

[...] the possibility and condition of reach for use, with safety and autonomy, of spaces, furniture, urban equipment, buildings, transportation, information, and communication, including their systems and technologies, as well as other services and facilities open to the public, of public or private use for collective use, both in urban and rural areas, by people with disabilities or reduced mobility (BRAZIL, 2015, our translation).

The rise in the number of enrolments of students with special needs - NEE³ in Higher Education has a key role for the proposals of inclusive education to solidify and gain space on the national scene, expanding the discussions on this issue. Several research have been developed and published, and this is essential for the promotion and advancement of accessibility and inclusion policies in higher education.

Oliveira *et al.* (2016) conducted a literature review on the scientific production regarding inclusive education in higher education and observed that most studies attributed SEN as resulting from the malfunction of the students' biopsychosocial development and not as a result of inefficient educational practices and barriers that prevent them from accessing the academic curricula under equal conditions with other students.

In this aspect, it is necessary to analyze the normatization and legitimacy of the admission and participation of the target audience of Special Education (physical, hearing, visual, intellectual, and high abilities/super ability) - PAEE in higher education institutions. Based on this assumption, Cabral and Melo (2017) concluded that there is still much to be done to ensure effective conditions for participation in social and academic spaces in university settings. In line with these findings, Anache and Cavalcante (2018) reiterate the importance of investments in infrastructure and professional training to promote inclusive educational policies, cultures, and practices in universities.

Neves, Maciel, and Oliveira (2019) conducted interviews with course coordinators about the inclusive practices of people with disabilities at the Federal University of Pará (UFPA). The participants' speeches revealed that, although the inclusion of people with disabilities in higher education is already part of our reality, there is a need for the consolidation of public policies and, especially, for reinventing the pedagogical practice. For these authors

[...] the recognition of the right to higher education does not mean the guarantee that the person with disabilities can exercise it, since it is still necessary that HEIs reinvent themselves in the dimensions of physical, pedagogical, and didactic structures, aiming to eliminate the barriers that prevent and/or limit the permanence of these people (NEVES; MACIEL; OLIVEIRA, 2019, p. 445, our translation).

Based on the increase in the number of enrollments of people with disabilities in higher education, as pointed out by INEP - National Institute for Studies and Research (2018), different

³ Supported by the studies of Stainback and Stainback (1999) NEEs are understood as those resulting from the interactions of students, with and/or without disabilities, which restrict and/or prevent their participation in academic life. These may be permanent or temporary, requiring specific institutional support of resources and/or differentiated services to provide the opportunity to equalize conditions that lead to the full expression of educational and comprehensive development in society.

studies seek to discuss accessibility aspects, such as equity of formative opportunity, at this stage of education. In general, they show concern in reporting the presence of assistive technology resources used in educational practices (FERNANDES; COSTA, 2015; FISCHER, 2019; MEDRADO; MELLO; TONELLIS, 2019; TOMELIN *et al.*, 2018), of differentiated strategies that promote the learning of the academic with disabilities in the classroom (DINIZ; ALMEIDA; FURTADO, 2019; LIMA *et al.*, 2016; SERRANO; OCHOA, 2018), evaluation of continuing education proposals for university teachers (LIMA *et al.*, 2016; NEVES; MACIEL; OLIVEIRA, 2019), identification of barriers (CIANTELLI; LEITE, 2016), among others.

Under the influence of inclusive national policies and studies developed on this topic, this article will describe the stages of adaptation of the *Index of Inclusion for Higher Education* (*Índice de Inclusión para Educación Superior - INES*), characterized as an instrument of information production, on different scopes of accessibility conditions in university socio-educational contexts.

The INES is characterized as an instrument developed by Colombian researchers, as a central part of the policy of organization of the Institutional Guidelines of Higher Education in the country (COLOMBIA, 2017). The instrument is divided into three questionnaires (with Likert-type scales), which seek to assess through 12 factors and 25 indicators, core issues of inclusive education with emphasis on the development of inclusive cultures, policies, and practices at the University. Thus, the instrument allows collecting information on the perception of staff, teaching staff and students regarding indicators ranging from the analysis of admission systems, permanence, and credits for students, to the analysis of academic development strategies, in conjunction with the processes of research and artistic and cultural creation in university training environments. Each factor consists of at least two indicators, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 – Factors and Indicators of the Index of Inclusion for Higher Education - INES

FACTOR	INDICADOR
1. Misión y Proyecto Institucional	1.1 Barreras para el aprendizaje y la participación
	1.2 Identificación y caracterización de estudiantes desde la educación inclusiva
2. Estudiantes	2.1 Participación de estudiantes
	2.2 Admisión, permanencia y sistemas de estímulos y créditos para estudiantes
3. Profesores	3.1 Participación docente
	3.2 Docentes inclusivos
4. Procesos académicos	4.1 Interdisciplinariedad y flexibilidad curricular

	4.2 Evaluación flexible
5. Visibilidad nacional e internacional	5.1 Inserción de la institución en contextos académicos nacionales e internacionales 5.2 Relaciones externas de profesores y estudiantes
6. Investigación y creación artística y cultural	6.1 Investigación, innovación y creación artística y cultural em educación inclusiva 6.2 Articulación de la educación inclusiva con los procesos de investigación, innovación y creación artística y cultural
7. Pertinencia e impacto social	7.1 Extensión, proyección social y contexto regional 7.2 Seguimiento y apoyo a vinculación laboral
8. Procesos de autoevaluación y autorregulación	8.1 Procesos de autoevaluación y autorregulación con enfoque de educación inclusiva 8.2 Estrategias de mejoramiento 8.3 Sistema de información inclusivo
9. Organización, administración y autorregulación	9.1 Procesos administrativos y de gestión flexibles 9.2 Estructura organizacional
10. Planta física y recursos de apoyo académico	10.1 Recursos, equipos y espacios de práctica 10.2 Instalaciones e infraestructura
11. Bienestar institucional	11.1 Programas de bienestar universitario 11.2 Permanencia estudiantil
12. Recursos financieros	12.1 Programas de educación inclusiva sostenibles 12.2 Apoyo financiero a estudiantes

Source: Colombia (2017, p. 31)

This document was developed from the constructs set out in the Guide for the assessment and improvement of inclusive education, originally "Index for educational inclusion", developed by Tony Booth and Mel Ainscow (2000), which has been translated into over 26 languages in different countries - whose main goals are directed to its implementation in basic education. In general, both instruments are characterized as methodological procedures for promoting political, cultural, and inclusive practices in educational settings. The translation/adaptation of the mentioned instruments to different levels of education, favor the decision making of learning, participation, and coexistence of the university community, as a fundamental aspect of the realization of the university institutional policy, as well as enables the consolidation in the search for financial support and international alliances.

This is a study that comprises a section of a doctoral research⁴ which in its entirety is dedicated to translating and adapting the INES for application to the university context with a view to identifying accessibility and inclusion parameters in a Brazilian public university;

⁴ LOUZADA, J. C. A. Responsible for the research "Parameters of accessibility and inclusion in a Brazilian university", linked to the Doctoral Program in Education at the São Paulo State University - Marília, under the supervision of Sandra Eli S. Oliveira Martins (CNPq/ 2018, current.).

profiling the participants; identifying and analyzing accessibility and inclusion barriers at the university as well as developing and presenting recommendations that allow the academic community to generate a plan to improve inclusive education at the University. In turn, this study is linked to a broader network research "Accessibility and Inclusion in Differentiated University Contexts" (Universal Program Call MCTIC/CNPq - 2018 Proc. 425167/2018-6 - current). And it is also in line with the studies of Nucleus 4 - Accessibility, Disability, and Inclusive Education, of the International Research

Network Project "Difference, Inclusion and Education" - CAPES/PRINT (PROPG 02/2019 Proc. AUXPE No. 88881.310517/2018-01) that integrates the International Research Network Project "Difference, Inclusion and Education", in the CAPES-PRINT-UNESP Agreement - "Theme plural societies".

Methodology

Venue and Participants

The present research was developed at the Faculty of Philosophy and Sciences (FFC) of the São Paulo State University (UNESP). University students with and without disabilities, employees and professors participated in this stage of the research. It is worth mentioning that the research participants were invited to participate voluntarily. The contact was made through the accessibility commission (AC) of the university, since, as a guest at the meeting, the researcher had the opportunity to explain the purpose of the research and make the invitation to those present, who were responsible for passing it on to other colleagues.

The idea of making the first contact with the participants during a meeting of the AC was based on the assumptions of INDEX (BOOTH; AINSCOW, 2000) and INES (COLOMBIA, 2017) that understand the school and academic community as the main actors of the actions developed in the school and university environment, thus, the committee is composed of these different subjects, thus, the Coordinating Group (CG) meetings were attended by at least one actor from each segment (students, staff and teachers) as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – Participants in the meetings of the Coordinating Group throughout the study

	Total	G1	G2	G3	G4
Professors	3	2	1	1	2
Students with disabilities	4	3	1	0	1
Students without disabilities	0	8	4	5	5
Employees	4	3	2	1	1
Total	21	16	8	7	9

Source: Prepared by the authors

In addition to the CG participants, the study included other participants in stages after these meetings. These stages were intended to evaluate and verify the understanding of the material developed in the CG. To this end, students from courses in different areas of knowledge (Humanities, Math and Biology) and participants of a study group within the research theme at another campus of the same university and another partner university participated in this phase. Table 3 presents the description of the participants in the different phases following the CGs, as well as the name adopted for each of these stages, which will be described below.

Table 3 – Participants of the instrument's assessment stages after the meetings of the Coordinating Group

Evaluation by Judges I (students from different areas)	Physical students	Education	Psychology students	Information students	Systems
	17		29		19
Evaluation by Judges II (researchers from the same Higher Education Institution)	Students of the thematic		Students of the thematic		
	5		2		
Evaluation by Judges III (researchers of the area in another Higher Education Institution)	Students of the thematic		Students of the thematic		
	1		3		

Source: Prepared by the authors

This stage of the study took place from the conformation of a working group called Coordinating Group (CG), represented by different members who work in one of the campuses of the participating institution. Mandatorily the conformation of this group included professor(s), student(s), professional(s) technical-administrative, with representation of the population segment highlighted in this study - university students with disabilities as shown in Table 2 presented above.

To use an instrument translated from another language, cultural adaptation is recommended, which is based on a process that involves language, through translation, as well as cultural adaptation in the phase of preparing the instrument for use in another country. This procedure aims to ensure linguistic, semantic, and cultural equivalence with the original instrument, in order to enable its application in the participating universities. In the present study, we chose to follow the recommendations suggested by Beaton *et al.* (2000; 2007) and the following phases were followed, namely:

In phase 1, the translation of the foreign language from Spanish to Portuguese was performed by a professional qualified for this activity and active in the theme in question.

After the return of the material, Phase 2 was characterized by the work and configuration of the Coordinating Group (CG), whose team met in monthly face-to-face meetings during approximately three hours for a period of 6 months with the purpose of evaluating the 25 indicators described in the instrument (COLOMBIA, 2017). This task required the team involved a critical position under the academic, reductionist and decontextualized discourses that deal with special educational demands of people with disabilities, to meet the formal and legal requirements disseminated by the government policy of Inclusive Education. All meetings had the audio of the discussions recorded and records were made of the main changes recommended throughout the meetings. At the end of 6 months, all relevant changes were made to the instrument, such as deletions, replacements, and additions of content to bring it closer to the local reality. After the instrument was adapted to the Brazilian university reality in question, the CG systematized the indicators "[in] the set of items that make up a Likert-type scale with measurement variables, in an increasing/decreasing score (0 to 4 points).

After forwarding a summary of the instrument for analysis of the statements to verify their understanding within the intended theme - evaluation by judges I, we began Phase 3. In this phase, a questionnaire was prepared consisting of the name of the indicator and its definition followed by the options 'yes' and 'no' whose respondents should mark 'yes' for definitions consistent with the title of the indicator and 'no' for definitions that were not consistent with the title. In cases of a negative response, the participants could fill in a field justifying their answer.

The relevance of the statements and the degree of agreement between the definition of the statements and their indicators were assessed at each phase of this stage of the research. It should also be noted that the procedures recommended by Leite and Lacerda (2018) were adopted regarding the validation of a scale of conceptions of disability, considering the

participation of students and researchers involved with the topic as judges about the procedures developed in the last three phases.

In possession of the students' answers, the phase 04 followed by an analysis of the statements analyzed in phase 03 by undergraduate students, considering those that did not show an agreement index equal to or greater than 75%. In this sense, they were submitted to a new evaluation by judges (II), this time experts in the area of inclusive education, participants of GEPDI - Group for Study and Research on Disability and Inclusion. These researchers evaluated the statements to elucidate possible gaps in the definition of indicators.

Phase 5 comprised the evaluation activities by a new group of judges (III), with expertise in the theme of the study. At this stage, the indicators and definitions were sent to a group of researchers from the Federal University of Santa Maria who work specifically with the following themes: Special Education, Inclusion and Difference, Inclusive Education, Accessibility in Higher Education, Inclusion and Accessibility Policies. At this point in the study, the purpose was to confirm the indicator-definition relationship. To this end, the researchers had the task of identifying which definition corresponded to each indicator, since they received two lists and only one of them was numbered. This phase was of utmost importance for this work since it brought the possibility of identifying criticisms to the instrument and present new possibilities of statements to format an effective and consistent instrument with the reality studied. The changes and suggestions proposed by this group of judges, as well as the other changes made to the initial document, will be presented in the results topic.

The 6th and last phase, called back translation or reverse translation, was characterized by the translation of the adapted version with all the cultural adjustments in Portuguese back into Spanish, to then be compared to the original text (COLOMBIA, 2017) by a professional fluent in both languages and in the area of the theme of the study. This phase aimed to ensure the reliability of the previous processes by ensuring that the initial idea of the instrument was maintained, restricting itself to translation and cultural adaptation only (SANTOS, 2016). Thus, the document materialized in its final adapted and translated version called INES-BRASIL.

Results

Throughout the adaptation process, the instrument went through different phases of analysis. Below we will present the results referring to each of the previously described phases. After translation into the local language, the material was submitted to the analysis of the

Coordinating Group composed of students, teachers, and employees with and without disabilities.

During the meetings, the CG members adjusted the indicators and guiding questions that enable a better understanding of the material. Among the main changes made, there were replacements for synonymous words in some indicators or questions, as well as detailing of information according to the example highlighted in Table 4, which points out underlined the excluded terms in the left column and in italics the terms replaced or added in the right column.

Table 4 – Presentation of the amendments made in indicator 1.2 of factor 1. Mission and institutional project

Original Instrument	Amended after the 1st Coordinating Group meeting
1.2 Identification and characterization of <u>inclusive education students</u>	1.2 Identification and characterization of the students
The institution identifies student diversity in its <u>particularities</u> (social, economic, political, cultural, linguistic, physical, geographic) and emphasizes those most likely to be excluded from the system.	The institution identifies student diversity-plurality in its <i>different manifestations/spheres</i> (social, economic, political, cultural, linguistic, <i>sensory, sexual, ethno-racial</i> , physical, geographic) and emphasizes those most likely to be excluded from the system.

Source: Prepared by the authors

It is worth mentioning that all indicators, as well as their guiding questions were analyzed by the CG during the meetings, and it was possible to observe that the review and adaptation of the indicators made the instrument consistent with the analysis of the issues of accessibility and inclusion of the context studied and likely to be applied in the next stages of the study.

The next step was phase 3, in which undergraduate students could assess the understanding of the indicators' statements as well as their definitions. At this stage, it was possible to observe that some indicators were not didactically clarified in their definitions, for example: "**INDICATOR:** Flexible Assessment. **DEFINITION:** The academic assessment processes rely on flexible tools and strategies that recognize the particularities, capabilities and potentialities of each student". This indicator had less than 75% agreement regarding its understanding and among the most cited arguments we can highlight the need to exemplify the academic assessment processes.

After this phase, the statements that presented agreement lower than 75% were analyzed and changed by a group of judges, as detailed above. In this sense, phase 4 indicated necessary substitutions in the definition of the indicators to make them easier to understand. An example of the changes made was the replacement of the word "identifies" by "perceives" in indicator

1. In this case, the verb "perceive" was chosen since it is more closely related to the meaning of images, impressions, and sensations when compared to the verb "identify. Another interesting example was the replacement of the word "self-regulation" by "regulation" in indicator 8, in this case the word used initially in the translation process did not bring exact meaning to the context applied, since self-regulate is to regulate oneself and the idea brought in the indicator is to regulate inclusive education and this involves the participation of all those involved in the academic community, thus, the term regulation was more consistent with the context in question.

All changes made were approved by the group that discussed them and agreed that they made the instrument more understandable, the debates at this stage enabled joint reflection on the indicators and allowed better drafting of the sentences.

Also, in this process of adapting the material, phase 5 was performed by other judges who also studied the topic in double-blind format, at which time the judges could read the indicators and identify their respective definitions. As a sequence, for those indicators that did not have their definitions correctly associated, the judges were asked to suggest a new wording, as shown in the example of Chart 5.

Table 5 – Example of one of the amendments made by the group of judges III

Post evaluation instrument by Judges II	Amended after evaluation by Judges III
1.2 Identification and characterization of the students	1.2 Identification and characterization of the students
The institution <u>perceives</u> student diversity-plurality in its different manifestations/spheres (social, economic, political, cultural, linguistic, sensory, sexual, ethno-racial, physical, geographical) and identifies those most likely to be excluded from the system.	The institution <i>uses instruments to get to know</i> student diversity-plurality in its different manifestations/spheres (social, economic, political, cultural, linguistic, sensory, gender, ethno-racial, physical, geographic) and identifies those most susceptible to being excluded or <i>marginalized</i> by the system.

Source: Prepared by the authors

In the above-mentioned example we observed the replacement of the word "perceive" by the sentence "uses instruments get to know" with the purpose of making the information clearer to the respondents and adequate to the university cultural conditions of the institution of origin of the study participants. Other changes of this nature were always made after several discussions between the judges involved. The last phase corresponded to the back translation, i.e., the final version of the material was translated into the original language and forwarded to a researcher from the same area of the study to proceed with the reading and possible criticisms and suggestions.

Contribution of INES use for research in Brazil on this theme

After all the steps described above, the final version of the document, called INES-Brazil, remained with 12 factors and 25 indicators, however, some factors had from one to three indicators. The possibilities of answers were maintained as the original instrument, thus being characterized by an instrument composed of a Likert scale ranging from 3 to 4 points according to the type of indicator (recognition 3 points; existence and frequency 4 points).

The adaptation of INES showed that there were modifications in part of the indicators that make up the 12 factors that make up the tool, which are likely to be applied in the next stages of the study. It was also possible to note that much of the tool could be maintained with only a few exclusions and minor changes focused more on the construction of the questions and indicators than on what was proposed by each of them, thus highlighting the objective proposed by the original tool for application in the national context.

The adjustments made enabled the indicators and their definitions to be brought closer to the context to which the instrument will be applied, that is, a Brazilian university. In this way, its adaptation for the Brazilian context may constitute a methodological resource for attention to diversity, for the detection of strengths and opportunities for improvement, and will help in decision-making that will enhance learning, participation, and coexistence in the community, enhancing decision-making actions to eliminate practices that exclude vulnerable groups in access to this stage of education.

Based on the responses of the academic community to this instrument, it will be possible to identify gaps regarding the development of inclusive cultures, policies, and practices, enabling reflection and proposing teaching strategies, policies, attitudes, among others that will contribute to a more inclusive and accessible university in all aspects.

The studies related to the presence of students with disabilities in higher education focus on the actions of access, permanence, and implementation of resources. Ferreira *et al.* (2016) point out a large gap between public policies on inclusion and what happens in practice within universities. For these authors, the debate on barriers and strategies in the university space should be widely discussed; more than that, students with disabilities should have a space to speak so that changes can be implemented based on the information of those who are targets of these barriers. Neves, Maciel, and Oliveira (2019, p. 444, our translation) state that "[...] there is still a long way to be built inside Brazilian universities, a way that goes through the consolidation of public policies and the reinvention of the pedagogical practice.

Corroborating with these authors, Peron and Michels (2015) point out that the university should expand its knowledge regarding the inclusion and accessibility policies, seeking to recognize the needs of those involved in this process. In this sense, they suggest the implementation of accessibility and inclusion committees, since this space at the university enables contact between management, faculty, and students, as highlighted in the experience developed at UFFS (PERON; MICHELS, 2015). Thus, there are in some federal universities in the country, the cores of accessibility, which play an important role in this aspect. These centers have the function of eliminating all types of barriers that may restrict the participation and academic performance of students with disabilities. Some actions developed by these centers include administrative aspects (contact agreements, equipment), pedagogical (adapted material, guidance to the faculty and management, continuing education) and psychosocial (thematic seminars involving the theme, training of servers etc.) (FERREIRA *et al.*, 2016; MEDRADO; MELLO; TONELLIS, 2019; PERON; MICHELS, 2015).

However, these centers only exist in the federal institutions; in the state and municipal institutions, a similar work is sought to be developed, but it moves gradually. The intention is to implement accessibility commissions; support programs; centers, among others, in all universities to reduce the distance between students with disabilities and the university community, thus strengthening the relationship between students and management, thus enabling new inclusion measures to be promoted to enhance the active participation of students with disabilities in higher education (MEDRADO; MELLO; TONELLIS, 2019; SILVA, 2014; TOMELIN *et al.*, 2018).

Thus, the application of an instrument that enables the identification of the main barriers observed by the academic community, whether they are related to inclusive practices, policies or cultures, will allow for progress in their removal, in addition to guiding institutions in the promotion of inclusion and accessibility strategies based on the complaints of the university students themselves, thus promoting a more inclusive and accessible university with the active participation of students with disabilities.

Finally, the development of this study allowed describing and clarifying the stages of translation and adaptation of the INES tool (COLOMBIA, 2017), called one of the stages of a broader research, as previously reported. Sharing the results of this stage of the study constitutes a responsive act of those involved with the theme. An attitude enunciated by the precepts of those who defend education as a revolutionary and listening act so that teachers, staff, and students (with/without disabilities), take the lead in creating more inclusive socio-educational

environments, on the horizon and without reservation, the guarantee of the fundamental rights of all to enter and ensure effective participation in the University.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: CNPq/CAPES – 140154/2019-1; MCTIC/CNPq – 425167/2018-6; CAPES/PRINT - AUXPE Nº 88881.310517/2018-01.

REFERENCES

ANACHE, A. A.; CAVALCANTE, L. D. Análise das condições de permanência do estudante com deficiência na Educação Superior. **Psicologia Escolar e Educacional**, n. esp., p. 115-125, 2018.

BEATON, D. *et al.* Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. **Spine**, v. 24, n. 25, p. 3186-3191, 2002.

BEATON, D. *et al.* **Recommendations for the cross-cultural adaptation for DASH & Quick DASH outcome measures.** Institute for work & health, 2007. 45 p.

BOOTH, T.; AINSCOW, M. (col.). **Guía para la mejora evaluación y mejora de la educación inclusiva.** CSIE. Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education. Reino Unido: CSIE, 2000. 130 f.

BRASIL. **Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva.** Documento elaborado pelo Grupo de Trabalho nomeado pela Portaria nº 555/2007, prorrogada pela Portaria nº 948/2007, entregue ao Ministro da Educação em 07 de janeiro de 2008.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015.** Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). Diário Oficial da União; Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 7 jul. 2015. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015-2018/2015/Lei/L13146.htm. Access: 10 Aug. 2016.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Referenciais de acessibilidade na educação superior e a avaliação in loco do sistema nacional de avaliação da educação superior (SINAES).** Brasília, DF: MEC, 2013. Available: <https://www.puc-campinas.edu.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/proavi-referenciais-de-acessibilidade-parte-i.pdf>. Access: 26 Apr. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. **Censo da educação superior – Sinopse Estatística da Educação Superior.** Brasília, DF: MEC/INEP, 2017. Available: <http://portal.inep.gov.br/web/guest/sinopsesestatisticas-da-educacao-superior>. Access: 01 Nov. 2018.

CABRAL, L. S. A.; MELO, F. R. L. V. Entre a normatização e a legitimação do acesso, participação e formação do público-alvo da educação especial em instituições de ensino superior brasileiras. **Educar em Revista**, n. esp. 3, p. 55-70, 2017.

COLÔMBIA. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. **Índice de inclusión para educación superior (INES)**. Bogotá, 2017. 158p.

DINIZ, I. C. S.; ALMEIDA, A. M.; FURTADO, C. C. University libraries: The role of an accessible campus on the inclusion of users with special needs. **TransInformação**, v. 31, p. 1-12, 2019.

FERNANDES, W. L.; COSTA, C. S. L. Possibilidades da Tutoria de Pares para Estudantes com Deficiência Visual no Ensino Técnico e Superior. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial**, v. 21, n. 1, p. 39-56, 2015.

FERREIRA, A. V. *et al.* Educação Inclusiva no ensino superior: principais desafios a serem superados. In: CONGRESSO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO, 3., 2016, Campina Grande, PB. **Anais [...]**. Campina Grande, PB: Realize Editora, 2016. Available: http://www.editorarealize.com.br/revistas/conedu/trabalhos/TRABALHO_EV056_MD1_SA7_ID4844_16082016200614.pdf. Access: 20 Mar. 2020.

FISCHER, M. L. Tem um estudante autista na minha turma! E agora? O diário reflexivo promovendo a sustentabilidade profissional no desenvolvimento de oportunidades pedagógicas para inclusão. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial**, v. 25, n. 4, p.535-552, 2019.

LEITE, L. P.; LACERDA, C. B. F. de. A construção de uma escala sobre as concepções de deficiência: procedimentos metodológicos. **Psicologia USP**, v. 29, n. 3, p. 432-441, 2018.

LIMA, A. *et al.* Inclusão no ensino superior: uma proposta de ação em psicologia escolar. **Psicologia Escolar e Educacional**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 175-177, 2016.

MACÊDO, L. **Avaliação, acessibilidade e inclusão de pessoas com deficiência nos cursos de graduação do sistema nacional da educação superior (SINAES)**. 2017. Available: <https://institutoitard.com.br/avaliacao-acessibilidade-e-inclusao-de-pessoas-com-deficiencia-nos-cursos-de-graduacao-do-sistema-nacional-da-educacao-superior-sinaes/>. Access: 26 Apr. 2020.

MEDRADO, B. P.; MELLO, D.; TONELLIS, J. R. A. Inclusive practices and policies in language teacher education courses. **DELTA**, v. 35, n. 3, p. 1-23, 2019.

NEVES, J. D. V.; MACIEL, R. A.; OLIVEIRA, M. V. S. Representações de práticas inclusivas: da realidade vivida aos caminhos da inclusão no ensino superior da Amazônia paraense. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos**, v. 100, n. 255, p. 443-463, 2019.

OEA. Organização dos Estados Americanos. **Convenção Interamericana para a Eliminação de todas as Formas de Discriminação contra as Pessoas Portadoras de Deficiência**. Guatemala: OEA, 1999. Available: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/guatemala.pdf>. Access: 25 Feb. 2019.

OLIVEIRA, R. Q. *et al.* A inclusão de pessoas com necessidades especiais no ensino superior. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial**, v. 22, n. 2, p. 299-314, 2016.

PERON, L.; MICHELS, L. R. F. Práticas Inclusivas na educação superior: a experiência da UFFS. *In*: CONGRESSO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO – EDUCERE, 12., 2015, Curitiba. **Anais** [...]. Curitiba, PR: PUCPR, 2015. Available: https://educere.bruc.com.br/arquivo/pdf2015/18088_7828.pdf. Access: 23 Mar. 2020.

SANTOS, P. N. D. **Tradução e adaptação transcultural do instrumento Wound quality of life**. 2016. 103 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Enfermagem) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Enfermagem, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, 2016.

SERRANO, E. A. P.; OCHOA, E. M. H. La orientación educativa en las prácticas inclusivas de la educación superior cubana. **Psicología Escolar e Educativa**, n. esp., p. 77-85, 2018.

STAINBACK, W.; STAINBACK, S. Colaboração, Rede de apoio e construção de comunidade. *In*: STAINBACK, W.; STAINBACK, S. (Ed.). **Inclusão: um guia para educadores**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1999. p. 223-230.

TOMELIN, K. N. *et al.* Educação inclusiva no ensino superior: desafios e experiências de um núcleo de apoio discente e docente. **Revista Psicopedagogia**, v. 35, n. 106, p. 94-103, 2018.

UNESCO. **Declaração de Salamanca**. Conferência Mundial sobre Educação Especial. Salamanca, Espanha, 1994. 17 p. Available: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/salamanca.pdf>. Access: 25 Feb. 2019.

UNICEF. **Declaração Mundial sobre Educação para Todos**. Conferência Mundial sobre Educação para Todos. Plano de Ação para Satisfazer as Necessidades Básicas de Aprendizagem. Aprovada pela Conferência Mundial sobre Educação para Todos. Jomtien, Tailândia: UNICEF, 1990. Available: <https://www.unicef.org/brazil/declaracao-mundial-sobre-educacao-para-todos-conferencia-de-jomtien-1990>. Access: 25 Feb 2019.

How to reference this article

LOUZADA, J. C. A.; MARTINS, S. E. S. O. Instrument for evaluating inclusive practices, cultures and policies in university contexts. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 17, n. 1, p. 0229-0244, Jan./Mar. 2022. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v17i1.15756>

Submitted: 19/10/2021

Required revisions: 30/11/2021

Approved: 28/12/2021

Published: 02/01/2022