

SISTEMA DE GESTÃO PEDAGÓGICA (SGP) E AVALIAÇÃO ESCOLAR: A INFLUÊNCIA DE UMA TECNOLOGIA NO AGIR DO COORDENADOR PEDAGÓGICO

SISTEMA DE GÉSTION PEDAGÓGICA (SGP) Y EVALUACIÓN ESCOLAR: LA INFLUENCIA DE UNA TECNOLOGÍA EM EL ACTUAR DEL COORDINADOR PEDAGÓGICO

PEDAGOGICAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SGP) AND SCHOOL EVALUATION: THE INFLUENCE OF A TECHNOLOGY ON THE PEDAGOGICAL COORDINATOR'S ACTION

Claudia Gonçalves da SILVA¹
Ricardo dos SANTOS²

RESUMO: Este trabalho tem como objetivo abordar a influência do Sistema de Gestão Pedagógica (SGP) – ferramenta tecnológica para registro pedagógico utilizado pela Rede Municipal de Ensino da Cidade de São Paulo – nas ações dos Coordenadores Pedagógicos ante à avaliação escolar. Foi realizado um estudo bibliográfico sobre avaliação para a aprendizagem, a função do Coordenador Pedagógico frente as atividades avaliativas, os recursos tecnológicos como facilitadores das ações avaliativas escolares e as funcionalidades existentes no SGP. Além disso, uma pesquisa de campo foi feita com Coordenadores Pedagógicos de escolas do Ensino Fundamental da Rede Municipal de São Paulo. Em uma junção entre tecnologia e pedagogia, o presente trabalho colabora para a reflexão sobre a qualidade de ensino, abordando o viés da avaliação escolar, com ênfase na aprendizagem para todos os alunos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação. Avaliação. SGP.

RESUMEN: *Este trabajo tiene como objetivo abordar la influencia del Sistema de Gestión Pedagógica (SGP) - herramienta tecnológica para registro pedagógico utilizado por la Red Municipal de Enseñanza de la Ciudad de São Paulo - en las acciones de los Coordinadores Pedagógicos ante la evaluación escolar. Se realizó un estudio bibliográfico sobre evaluación para el aprendizaje, la función del Coordinador Pedagógico frente a las actividades evaluativas, los recursos tecnológicos como facilitadores de las acciones evaluativas escolares y las funcionalidades existentes en el SGP. Además, una encuesta de campo fue hecha con Coordinadores Pedagógicos de escuelas de la Enseñanza Fundamental de la Red Municipal de São Paulo. En una unión entre tecnología y pedagogía, el presente trabajo colabora para la reflexión sobre la calidad de la enseñanza, abordando el sesgo de la evaluación escolar, con énfasis en el aprendizaje para todos los alumnos.*

¹Federal University of Technology of Paraná – (UTFPr), Medianeira – Paraná – Brazil. Specialist in Education: Methods and Techniques of Teaching. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7625-570X>. E-mail: claugons@hotmail.com

² Federal University of Technology of Paraná – (UTFPr), Medianeira – Paraná – Brazil. Active Professor. Head of the Academic Department of Human Sciences, Letters and Arts. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1266-2880>.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Educación. Evaluación. SGP.*

ABSTRACT: *This work aims to address the influence of the Pedagogical Management System (SGP) - a technological tool for pedagogical registration used by the Municipal Education Network of the City of São Paulo - in the actions of the Pedagogical Coordinators in front of the school evaluation. A bibliographic study was carried out on evaluation for learning, the role of the Pedagogical Coordinator in relation to the evaluation activities, the technological resources as facilitators of the school evaluation actions and the functionalities existing in the SGP. In addition, a field research was done with Pedagogical Coordinators of elementary schools of the Municipal Network of São Paulo. In a junction between technology and pedagogy, the present work contributes to the reflection on the quality of teaching, addressing the bias of school evaluation, with emphasis on learning for all students.*

KEYWORDS: *Education. Evaluation. SGP.*

Introduction

This research aimed to address the influence of the Pedagogical Management System (SGP, Portuguese initials), as a technological tool, in the guidance provided by the pedagogical coordinators regarding the evaluative didactic actions in elementary schools in the city of São Paulo, of the Regional Directorate of Education - Santo Amaro (DRESA). Based on the data offered by three municipal schools in the Santo Amaro region, it was possible to analyze how the SGP contributes to the work of the Pedagogical Coordinator in favor of the qualification of pedagogical actions in the evaluation process of elementary school students.

The data were collected from the field research carried out through a questionnaire applied to pedagogical coordinators who presented, in training meetings held at the Regional Directorate of Education - Santo Amaro, a compromise in the use of the SGP in the daily school management, thus being able to collaborate with assertiveness regarding the system's functionalities.

The interest in this research came after the implementation of the SGP, which started in the municipal elementary schools of São Paulo, in February 2014, through Ordinance 1,224. The Educational Units, until then, historically, used to make their pedagogical records in the printed class diary, faced a technological tool that stores all didactic data in a digital way. It was, thus, the beginning of a great challenge (which lasts until today, since the Decree in question is relatively recent).

The SGP, due to its transparency and accessibility, has repercussions on the didactic actions of educators and promotes reflection on the influence of technology on pedagogical

action. The system, unlike printed records, does not allow the insertion of data outside the current bimonthly period; links the assignment of final concepts to at least one registered evaluation activity; allows educators to monitor, in real time, the percentage of attendance of each student; allows the pedagogical coordinators to visualize the school performance of each student/class; among other functions.

Thus, after the implementation of the SGP, some pedagogical actions needed to be revised and adapted. What, previously, the “paper accepted”, the system no longer accepts. In addition, the available functionalities allow an analysis of the pedagogical records and provide an opportunity for the management team to reflect on the students' learning process. The school is faced with a technological resource that requires, in addition to digital records, a commitment to teaching qualification. This new educational dynamic in the teaching and learning movement, provided by SGP, are the focus of this research.

What is the SGP?

The Pedagogical Management System (SGP) is a technological system that organizes, stores and manages the pedagogical records. The educational information contained in the SGP (lesson plans, attendance, evaluation activities, grades, final concepts, among others) are inserted by educators, that is, the system does not make automatic pedagogical filling. After the insertion and consolidation of data (carried out bimonthly), parents/guardians can access the school report card (which contains the bimonthly notes/grades and observations made by educators); teachers and school administrators are able to access and analyze their school's pedagogical data, in the form of reports, graphs and spreadsheets that summarize the students' trajectory. When organizing the pedagogical follow-up, in the form of synthetic documents (and synthesizing does not mean reducing or omitting data, but facilitating the general analysis of the set of information), it is possible to diagnose demands and identify qualities, supporting the direction of the management team towards pedagogical actions of educators, favoring quality education.

The SGP thus constitutes, as well as being a tool for digital records, it becomes, therefore, a technological instrument that facilitates the reflection of the teaching and learning process, assisting in the work of the management team (it is emphasized the importance of the action of the pedagogical coordinator, key manager for teacher training) in making decisions to achieve the educational objectives of the Educational Unit.

SGP Functionalities

The SGP consists of several functionalities, ranging from daily records referring to attendance and the lesson plan, to reports for managers that consolidate data from the educational process. All registrations are made digitally (by electronic address - SGP Web or by the Portal of the Municipal Secretariat of Education) through computers with internet connection or by application installed on tablets (SGP tablet). The tablets listed as assets of the Educational Unit allow that, in the event of a lack of internet connection, the records are made offline and, after synchronization of the tablets, the information is updated in the SGP.

For access to the SGP, the municipal public servant informs Functional Registry and password.

Teacher registration

When logging into the system, if the server has classes assigned for that school year, the home page will show your class(es), course, shift, type of teaching and classes given. In this functionality, called My Classes, the teacher visualizes their classes and accesses icons of each room. Below is a brief explanation of each field and its operation:

a) Classes given:

Presentation of the overview of the classes planned, completed and answers of the school year in that class, by two months.

b) Planning:

It allows visualization of the records made by the educators regarding the Annual Planning (which is subdivided into tabs for Initial Diagnosis of the class and Bimonthly periods), Plan for the student (in case of specific planning for a student), Documents (with Federal, Municipal and each Educational Unit - EU).

c) Class Diary:

Tool that displays and allows the teacher's daily records: lesson plans, attendance, assessment activities and notes. By clicking on the Lesson Plan field, it is possible to observe the lesson planning, its objective and the content(s) worked with the class. In the Frequency field, students' frequencies and absences are noted (with the teacher pointing out only absences, fields not indicated by the teacher, are read by the system as the students' presence). In the Evaluation Activities field, the educator records the evaluations given to students. In the Notes field, the teacher makes records that he deems as pertinent and valid for the class of the day.

All these fields are available to be performed by the teacher during the term of the period in question. The EU management team is not allowed to record these fields presented.

d) *Listão* (List):

It is subdivided into Frequency List, Assessment List and Lesson Plan List, all of which allow a complete view of the data related to absences and attendance, registered evaluation activities and two-month lesson plans.

In the attendance list it is also possible to mark the students' attendance (thus, the attendance record can be made in the Class Diary or in the *Listão*), as well as to make up for the absence of students when necessary.

In the Evaluation List, the teacher, in addition to viewing the evaluation activities, types in the grades or notes of his curricular component at the end of each two-month period. Notes/grades information automatically migrates to the Closing field.

The Lesson Plan List presents daily plans in a list, making it easy to view plans in sequence. The educator can also make your records in this field.

e) Closure:

Screen that has the consolidation of bimonthly pedagogical data; presents the name of each student in the class, his/her grade, post-council grade, number of absences, compensations, frequency (in percentage), class council (with council records, such as: development and learning, recommendations to the student, recommendations to parents, conclusive opinion and visualization of conceptual data and frequency of all the curricular components of the class) and bulletin (which can be printed).

Reports

To facilitate the analysis of data entered by teachers in the system, the SGP generates reports that synthesize and/or allow the analysis of the individual development of students or the development of the class in the learning process. These reports make it possible for teachers and managers to analyze the evaluation path and make the relevant referrals.

There are reports in the SGP for teachers and reports for managers. In the tab Reports for teachers, according to the information entered by the teacher himself, the system consolidates: graphs of assessment activities (with the tabulation of the results of each assessment activity), bimonthly card (containing the summary of grades, absences, compensation of absence and percentage of attendance in the curricular component), attendance report (indicating the attendance of students, day-to-day of the two-month period), summary of

the syllabus and activities developed (with the description of the dates and content of each class in the two-month surveyed), students' notes (note of the notes recorded on the students).

In the Reports for managers tab, with access and visualization only for the school management team, more general data that helps for a more global analysis of the learning process is provided. Allow consultation of:

a) Final Minutes of results:

It is the document that consolidates the grades, attendance, compensation for absences, percentage of attendance, conclusive opinion and school days for the whole class. In these minutes, there is the indication, with differentiation of colors, of inactive students (transferred or dropping out) and students with frequency below the percentage indicated by law (Municipal Ordinance of São Paulo no. 5,941 of October 15, 2013).

b) Individual monitoring of grades/concepts:

This feature generates a graph that points out the bimonthly grades/concepts of each curricular component of the student in the class. Thus, it is possible to make a more detailed observation of the students' pedagogical development.

c) Evaluation summary of all components (bar):

Through this functionality, the manager can view, at the end of the bimonthly period (or shortly after the insertion of the bimonthly grades/concepts performed by the teachers) the results of the evaluative activities of each curricular component. In the bar graph, there is a breakdown of the students' grades/concepts by component.

d) Analysis of classes of the year by component:

The system allows comparative analysis, through a bar graph, of the number of grades/concepts of the same curricular component in different classes of the same series/cycle.

e) Pedagogical report:

Functionality that generates the educational path of the student, since 2014, with the description of his school report card (with grades/concepts and bimonthly absences and end of the school year; observations of the Class Council), individual observations (migrated from the Notes feature of the Diary field class), among other information (such as justification for absences and relocations and reclassifications).

School evaluation from a learning perspective

The discussion about school evaluation is not innovative, nor is it unprecedented. It has been a theme that has long been questioned, reflected and conceived. So many studies have

resulted in awareness of the relevance of evaluation in pedagogical practices. After all, it is through evaluation that it is possible to analyze and contribute to the achievement of objectives in the teaching and learning process.

Despite this increase in the value given to evaluation in the school routine, evaluating, at times, sounds, in a preponderant way, as a measuring instrument, with a taxing purpose, even of a binomial characteristic: those who achieved the objectives and those who did not. From this perspective, the evaluation would serve to classify and nothing more. It would become proof that the teaching work was carried out, judged and presented in the form of grades or concepts. From this scenario, there would be nothing to be done, in a determinism, minimally, inhumane with students, teachers and education. The evaluation would take on a sovereign position in the school with undisputed verdicts through the rationality of the data. It would not matter, in this way, the route, the (re)planning, the individuality, teaching and learning within the entire school context.

The pedagogical rethink, based on the evaluation, involves all the actors of the school, including the student, who is not a passive being in this process, on the contrary, he is the protagonist of his learning and needs to be clear about how he is evaluated and what is expected of him. When the evaluative act allows students to give feedback, allowing them to become aware of their difficulties and potential, according to Gonçalves (2015), the student will seek the construction of strategies that foster their skills to overcome their needs. Being an active subject in your learning is having the opportunity to reflect and act in the face of explicit educational objectives, overcoming the idea of evaluation as an instrument of threat, punishment and exclusion (which emphasizes teaching authoritarianism). Therefore, a democratization of teaching is valued, which implies the student's access to school, in the permanence and termination of their studies (LUCKESI, 1996).

Thus, evaluating is at the service of education. When evaluating for the learning of all students, there is, according to Hoffmann (1998), the commitment of teachers and the school to issue value judgments and make decisions that meet the needs of each student, respecting their differences. The assessment, from the perspective of learning, is designed for students and from them, in a collective context without exclusions. From this perspective, there is no punitive evaluation, which oppresses and segregates. The student is the reason for conscious pedagogical action for the practice of inclusive education.

The role of the pedagogical coordinator in evaluative pedagogical actions

“Due to the narrowness or breadth of his gaze [...], the educator is committed to the evaluative act” (HOFFMANN, 1998, p. 15). This look, however, is not instinctive, it is a look that needs to be refined, rationalized and theoretically grounded to be useful to the educational process. In this context, the role of a professional becomes essential: the pedagogical coordinator. It is he who, in the face of school routine, questions, guides, welcomes and clarifies, undertaking actions that seek to favor the teaching and learning process (LIBÂNEO, 2005).

When it comes to the evaluation process, it is essential the existence of a problematizing pedagogical action that encourages educators to analyze the situations of evaluation and educational planning in order to overcome the difficulties encountered. The pedagogical coordinator, as a trainer, should then direct the information provided by the evaluation process to “initiatives capable of helping teachers to teach and students to learn” (MONTEIRO *et al.*, 2012, p. 94). In this perspective, this professional, according to Almeida and Placco (2011), has linked to him a transforming role for relating him to the commitment to criticality, helping the teacher in his reflective practice.

The role of the pedagogical coordinator, according to Monteiro *et al.* (2012), he is no longer the inspector of educational practices and the manager of bureaucratic activities, to legitimize himself as a trainer and partner of educators. Therefore, when assuming its formative role, the pedagogical coordinator provides better conditions for teachers to build and carry out their actions for the qualification of the teaching and learning process, favoring a school space for the democratization of knowledge to, “in fact, grant the right of all students to learn” (MONTEIRO *et al.*, 2012, p. 33).

Technological resources as facilitating tools before school evaluations

With the technological resources available, it is currently not possible to disassociate the educational work from digital tools. When dealing with technology as a form of registration, it is important to note that it cannot be characterized as an end to school activities. The findings made with the help of technological tools should not be of greater value than the curious and investigative eye of each educator. The resources that technology offers, due to its dynamism, transparency and accessibility, need to become a target for reflection by educators so that they can reach the school's goals. After all, technology has “another creative, scientific space, [...] by speeding up the organization, checking data and analyzing it” (CARVALHO; BARBIERI, 1997, p. 18).

According to Hoffmann (1998), questioning is part of the educator's inquiring gaze. In this way, spreadsheets, graphs and reports generated by technological resources without the educator's inquiring look would be no more than tools that emphasize measuring assessments with a classificatory and excluding bias. Technological tools can be used as a subsidy for pedagogical action (RAMOS; COPPOLA, 2009), because by providing the analysis of the records of the evaluation process, according to Almeida and Placco (2006), opportunities for reflecting on educational actions are highlighted in search of consistency between what is desired and reality, between theory and practice. Through the detailed information generated by digital resources with the dynamism of the technologies, a thorough analysis of the educators in the face of the evaluation process is made possible.

This movement of observations and reflections, mediated by the Pedagogical Coordinator (as a professional who articulates collective work and a trainer) allows decision-making with the objective of guaranteeing learning for all students. After all, according to Freire (2001, p. 43), “it is by thinking critically about today's or yesterday's practice that the next practice can be improved”.

Methodological procedures

For the consolidation of this academic work, a field research was carried out in elementary schools in the municipal school system in the city of São Paulo. Due to Municipal Ordinance no. 1,224/14 that “institutes the Pedagogical Management System - SGP within the scope of the Municipal Education Network of São Paulo”, all Educational Units have, since then, carried out their pedagogical records in this digital system.

The research work was centered in the southern region of the city of São Paulo, specifically, with schools belonging to the Regional Board of Education - Santo Amaro. A stratified sampling survey was used (GIL, p. 92, 2008), which is characterized by the selection of the sample from a subgroup, that is, from a certain set belonging to a larger collective. When conducting a stratified sampling, there is a focus on common properties of this set, thus, three schools (specifically, a Pedagogical Coordinator from each School Unit) were invited to participate in the research. The choice of these Units was made based on the indication of the outstanding work of the Pedagogical Coordinators who carry out their activities at SGP and socialized the fulfillment of Ordinance 1,224/14 in training meetings at the Regional Board of Education - Santo Amaro. The three Pedagogical Coordinators invited to participate in this research publicly demonstrated, in training meetings held at the Regional Directorate of

Education - Santo Amaro, the interest in knowing and using the various functionalities of the SGP, relating them to the practices of Pedagogical Coordination.

The survey with the Pedagogical Coordinators was done through an online questionnaire sent by email to the schools where they work. The choice of the research strategy through a questionnaire was because it allowed the interviewees to answer the research questions at the time, they deemed pertinent.

The data collected through the questionnaire answered by the Pedagogical Coordinators were organized so that they can offer propositions about the problem of this research. The closed questions, after being tabulated, electronically, led to indications of what is typical of the group, helping in the process of interpreting the answers and discussing the results. The open questions, of qualitative character, were analyzed considering the steps of Miles and Huberman (1994 *apud* GIL, 2008, p. 175).

The importance of conceptualizing data analysis procedures does not stand out from the reflection provided by the systematization of information. The description and organization of the data obtained, whether quantitative or qualitative, need to promote the interpretation of responses.

Results and discussion

According to the answers provided by the three Pedagogical Coordinators of municipal elementary schools in the municipal network of São Paulo, located in the Regional Directorate of Education - Santo Amaro, it is possible to analyze and signify the information obtained. All the interviewed coordinators stated that they use the SGP at least two to three times a week, and during a bimonthly closing period, one of them points out that she uses the system daily.

Of the four assessment tools contained in the SGP, the coordinators listed two as the most used in the work of the Pedagogical Coordination: first, the *Synthesis of Assessment* tool, all components and, as the second most used, the *Final Results* tool.

The two tools listed as the least priority were the *Analysis of the classes of the year by component* and the *individual Monitoring of grades/concepts*. It is important to emphasize, however, that the classification made does not imply the uselessness of tools, but only reflects the functionalities of the system that are less explored by the interviewed coordinators.

The *Evaluation Synthesis* feature, all components, according to the interviewees' opinion, allow the joint discussion between teachers and pedagogical coordinators of the criteria

for grades/concepts assigned and the observation, monitoring and evaluation of the development of the learning process of students.

The tool *Final results* was pointed out as one of the most used by the pedagogical coordinators who answered the questionnaire because it allows the wide visualization of grades/concepts and class frequency, in all curricular components, providing the monitoring of the students' learning process.

The Pedagogical Coordinators also answered about what the SGP brought in term of advantages and disadvantages to the development of their function, after its implementation in the municipal school system. The disadvantages mentioned were, first, the appropriation of the use of the SGP in the year of implementation and, later, the slowness of the system during the closing periods of the two-month period due to the overload of accesses by educators.

However, many advantages of the SGP to the Pedagogical Coordinator's work were pointed out: the possibility of observing and analyzing, in a quick and synthesized way, the evaluative data through the system's functionalities (such as graphs); easy access to the pedagogical records of all curriculum components (from annual planning to lesson plans); optimization of service to families (through, in particular, individual reports such as the *Individual monitoring of grades/concepts*); the feasibility of rethinking and redesigning pedagogical actions when viewing, in a comprehensive way, the development of student learning in the reports offered in the system, especially during Class Councils.

Finally, the coordinators were asked what contributions the use of the SGP can provide during the closing periods of the two-month period, considering the formative role of their function. The answers referred to the discussion of the results through the reports (graphs) generated by the system; speed in the tabulation of the results of the evaluation activities, assisting in the redesign of the pedagogical actions; possibility of recording about the development of the students' learning process during the Class Council (in the Closure screen); possibility of exchanging experiences between teachers (stimulated and mediated by the Pedagogical Coordinator) when analyzing the difficulties and skills of the classes explained in the graphics generated from the system's functionalities.

It is possible to note that it is clear to the Pedagogical Coordinators interviewed that the evaluation instruments and their analysis serve to raise awareness of the teaching practice itself and that they are starting points for the coordinator's incentive for teachers to constantly revisit their teaching plans favoring the learning of all students.

Final considerations

The pedagogical actions in a school must focus exclusively on the learning of all students. There is no sense in developing activities with collective discussions, supported by technological resources, articulated by the Pedagogical Coordinator, if they serve only a few; if they leave, in the middle of the way, the one labeled with difficulty; exclusion and evaluation predominate, therefore, as an end. The evaluative actions and the instruments used for the analysis of these data will only be valid if they are characterized as pointing the students' development towards the achievement of the educational objectives.

The Pedagogical Management System (SGP), as a technological tool, becomes a facilitating tool for the work of qualifying the teaching and learning process by allowing the Pedagogical Coordinator to use it collectively with the teachers. When organizing the pedagogical records, the SGP allows the Pedagogical Coordinators, through the information generated by the system and access and appreciation by the entire school team, to promote the reflection of the direction of the educational actions. When it comes to the evaluation, in particular, the SGP is appointed by the Pedagogical Coordinators, interviewed in this research, as an instrument that provides questions about the systematized data. In this way, the Pedagogical Coordinator, as an articulator and trainer, problematizes and guides actions that favor the achievement of the goals proposed by the school, leading to the reflection of the need for re-planning in order to overcome the difficulties encountered. After all, evaluations should be used to think and plan teaching practice (SACRISTÁN; GÓMEZ, 1998).

The evaluation thus becomes, with the help of the data provided and systematized by the SGP, the starting point for the democratization of knowledge. The verification of data, through the SGP, needs to sharpen the investigative look of each educator, encouraged by the potential trainer of the school: the Pedagogical Coordinator. It will be through the dynamism and ease of access provided by the SGP, combined with the transforming role of the Pedagogical Coordinator, that the results of the evaluative actions will allow the analysis by the educators and later collective decision-making that will aim to guarantee the learning for all students through inclusive education.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, L. R.; PLACCO, V. M. N. de S. (orgs). O papel do coordenador pedagógico. **Revista Educação**, set. 2011.

CARVALHO, C. P.; BARBIERI, M. R. Formação de professores em tempo de informática. *In: UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO (USP). Comunicação e Educação*. São Paulo: Ed. Moderna, ano III, n. 9, 1997.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 20 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2001.

GIL, A. C. **Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social**. 6 ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.

GONÇALVES, F. C. N. A. Avaliação escolar: uma estratégia para promoção do protagonismo do aluno. **IV Colóquio Internacional: educação, cidadania e exclusão: didática e avaliação**. Rio de Janeiro, 2015.

HOFFMANN, J. M. L. **Contos e contrapontos: do pensar ao agir em avaliação**. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 1998.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. **Educação escolar, políticas, estruturas e organização**. 2 ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005.

LUCKESI, C. C. **Avaliação da aprendizagem escolar**. 3ª ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 1996.

MONTEIRO, E. *et al.* **Coordenador pedagógico: função, rotina e prática**. 1 ed. Palmeiras, BA: Instituto Chapada de Educação e Pesquisa, 2012.

RAMOS, M.; COPPOLA, N. C. **O uso do computador e da internet como ferramentas pedagógicas**. Paraná, 2009. Disponível em: www.diaadiaeducacao.pr.gov.br/portals/pde/arquivos/2551-8.pdf. Acesso em: 20 de mar 2018.

SACRISTÁN, J. G; GÓMEZ, A. I. P. **Compreender e transformar o ensino**. 4 ed. Porto Alegre: ArtMed, 1998.

SÃO PAULO (SP). **Programa Mais Educação São Paulo: subsídios 2: Sistema de Gestão Pedagógica – SGP e a Avaliação para a Aprendizagem/Secretaria Municipal de Educação**. São Paulo: SME/ DOT, 2014.

SÃO PAULO (SP). **Roteiro de uso**. S/d. Disponível em: <https://github.com/prefeiturasp/SME-SGP/wiki/Roteiro-de-uso>. Acesso em: 20 de mar de 2018.

How to quote this article

SILVA, Claudia Gonçalves da; SANTOS, Ricardo dos. Sistema de Gestão Pedagógica (SGP) e avaliação escolar: a influência de uma tecnologia no agir do coordenador pedagógico. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. 1, p. 86-99, jan./abr. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24i1.12848>

Submitted: 23/06/2019

Required revisions: 05/10/2019

Approved: 23/11/2019

Published: 06/01/2020