O USO DOS RESULTADOS DO SARESP COMO INSTRUMENTO DE GESTÃO ESCOLAR: BOLETIM PEDAGÓGICO E AVALIAÇÃO INSTITUCIONAL

EL USO DE LOS RESULTADOS DE SARESP COMO INSTRUMENTO DE GESTIÓN ESCOLAR: BOLETÍN PEDAGÓGICO Y EVALUACIÓN INSTITUCIONAL

THE USE OF SARESP RESULTS AS A SCHOOL MANAGEMENT INSTRUMENT: PEDAGOGICAL BULLETIN AND INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

Claudia Pereira de Pádua SABIA[1]

RESUMO: O Sistema de Avaliação do Rendimento Escolar de São Paulo foi criado em 1996. O objetivo deste estudo é identificar se os resultados do SARESP 2016 foram discutidos entre gestores e professores e quais foram os encaminhamentos; verificar também se as escolas realizam a avaliação institucional de modo a subsidiar a gestão escolar. A metodologia utilizada é a pesquisa bibliográfica, pesquisa documental e a coleta de dados. Como resultados, o estudo apresenta que os alunos das escolas com proficiência básico ou abaixo do básico tiveram como encaminhamento, basicamente, a recuperação no contraturno no Programa Novo Mais Educação e aspectos que a comprometem. Em relação à Avaliação Institucional o que é denominado como tal não consiste "de fato" em um processo de busca pela compreensão da realidade escolar. É utilizado apenas um Instrumento de AI fornecido pela Diretoria de Ensino que consiste em um questionário aplicado no último dia de aula.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Avaliação dos sistemas de ensino. SARESP. Avaliação institucional. Planejamento didático-pedagógico.

RESUMEN: *El Sistema de Evaluación del Desempeño Escolar de São Paulo se creó en 1996. El objetivo de este estudio es identificar si los resultados de SARESP 2016 fueron discutidos entre gerentes y maestros y cuáles fueron las referencias; Compruebe también si las escuelas llevan a cabo la evaluación institucional para subsidiar la gestión escolar. La metodología utilizada es la investigación bibliográfica, la investigación documental y la recopilación de datos. Como resultado, el estudio muestra que los estudiantes de escuelas con dominio básico o inferior al básico tuvieron como referencia básicamente la recuperación durante el día en el Programa Educativo Novo Mais y los aspectos que lo comprometen. Con respecto a la evaluación institucional, lo que se denomina como tal no consiste "de hecho" en un proceso de búsqueda de comprender la realidad escolar. Solo se utiliza un Instrumento de IA proporcionado por la Junta Directiva y consiste en un cuestionario aplicado el último día de clase.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Evaluación de sistemas educativos. SARESP. Evaluación institucional. Planificación didáctico-pedagógica.*

[1] São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Assistant Teacher of the Department of Management and School Supervision (DASE) of the College of Philosophy and Sciences (FFC). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8173-6420. E-mail: claudia.sabia@unesp.br or fsabia@uol.com.br

ABSTRACT: *The São Paulo School Performance Assessment System was created in 1996. The aim of this study is to identify if the results of SARESP (Portuguese initials) 2016 were discussed between managers and teachers and what were the referrals; also check if the schools carry out the institutional evaluation in order to subsidize the school management. The methodology used is bibliographic research, documentary research and data collection. As a result, the study shows that students from schools with basic or below basic proficiency had as a referral, basically, the recovery during the other shift in the Novo Mais Educação Program and aspects that compromise it. Regarding Institutional Evaluation, what is termed as such does not consist "in fact" in a process of seeking to understand the school reality. Only one AI Instrument provided by the Board of Directors is used and consists of a questionnaire applied on the last day of class.*

KEYWORDS: *Evaluation of education systems. SARESP. Institutional evaluation. Didactic-pedagogical planning.*

Introduction

It should be noted that the focus of this work is the SARESP, that is, an evaluation of the state system of São Paulo, which in 2017 completed its twentieth edition. We consider that the large-scale evaluation has come a long way in Brazil and since the 1990s, national, state and, in the last years, municipal evaluations have been systematically implemented.

According to Bauer *et al.* (2015, p. 328) the expansion of large-scale evaluation initiatives implemented by the federal or state governments was intensified after the creation, in 2007, of the Basic Education Development Index – IDEB (Portuguese initials) by the National Institute for Studies and Educational Research Anísio Teixeira – INEP (Portuguese initials).

In a recent study, the aforementioned author reports that at the state level, of the 27 Brazilian states, twenty already have their own evaluation systems and 1573 municipalities already have their evaluation systems, most of them created from 2005. The study also presents evidence the consolidation of large-scale evaluation as a tool for educational management of municipalities (BAUER *et al.,* 2017, p. 5).

The use of large-scale evaluation as a management tool for municipalities and states was adopted in Brazil a few decades later than in other countries around the world. Particularly in the United States, the accountability process started from the Coleman Report in 1966.

According to Ravitch (2002) "interest in accountability can be attributed to the 1966 historical report, Equality of Educational Opportunity, known as the Coleman Report after its lead author, sociologist James Coleman" (RAVITCH, 2002, p. 14).

The author points out that the study was significant for many reasons, one of which was the shift in the research focus from input to outcome, which resulted from the authors' decision to examine how school resources affected their achievement. Prior to the Coleman report, education reform in the United States focused solely on the issue of resources, assuming more generous provisions for teacher salaries, facilities, textbooks, and supplies would "fix" the nation's schools. Following the release of the Coleman report, reformers moved forward on a wide range of proposals, many of which sought changes in performance rather than (or beyond) resource increases. The shift of focus from inputs (resources) to results has been facilitated by increased availability of test results.

We also highlight that the authors Evers and Walberg (2002) who, in this work, present a set of contributions on the issue of accountability, by authors who specialize in education studies from the perspectives of social and behavioral sciences: history, economics, political science and psychology.

Following this brief synthesis of accountability in the United States, we resumed accountability initiatives in Brazil. According to Brooke and Cunha (2015),

> The Articulated Action Plan - PAR implemented by MEC in 2007, contemplating, originally, priority municipalities due to the IDEB achieved in 2005, can be classified here as a federal resource allocation policy based on the results of the external evaluation. With the extension of the plan to all municipalities, the policy has acquired connotations of accountability (BROOKE; CUNHA, 2015, p. 459).[2]

Accountability is a policy of "taking responsibility" that has consequences for school agents. We can cite as examples of educational accountability policies: the teaching bonus - due to the achievement of goals; the awarding of students or schools - with outstanding positive performance in large scale assessments and; sanctions and interventions in schools - which have not met their targets.

We also highlight the contribution of Brooke and Cunha (2011), that the

> [...] accountability in the educational context means, above all, the association between learning outcomes and consequences for the educational district, school, teachers or students. The degree of pressure that the educational authority wishes to apply to the induction process can be calibrated according to the type or seriousness of the consequences. In this context, it is common to label the highest pressure/induction levels as high-stakes and the lowest

---

[2] O Plano de Ações Articuladas – PAR implantado pelo MEC em 2007 e que contemplava, originalmente, os municípios considerados prioritários em função do IDEB alcançado em 2005, pode ser classificado aqui como uma política de alocação de recursos federais com base nos resultados da avaliação externa. Com a extensão do plano para todos os municípios, a política adquiriu conotações de accountability (BROOKE; CUNHA, 2015, p. 459).

levels as low-stakes, using the English word stakes, which means "the value a gambler puts into play" (BROOKE; CUNHA, 2011, p. 22).[3]

The authors also highlight that in some states, such as Ceará, Pernambuco and Amazonas, awards were created for schools with better results in state and, such as in the city of Rio de Janeiro in 2010, municipalities as well had those awards (BROKE; CUNHA, 2015). In addition to the awards, bonuses have been created, in various states, for teachers in schools that have met the established goals. The study by Capocchi (2017) presents a table with types of teacher bonus in Brazil by federation units. In the state of São Paulo, the Bonus for Results (BR) was implemented in 2008, based on the fulfillment of SARESP goals (SÃO PAULO, 2008).

After these initial considerations, we present that the objective of this study is to identify if the results of SARESP 2016, from the 9th grade of elementary school, were discussed between managers and teachers of the selected schools and what were the referrals; also check whether schools carry out institutional evaluation. The research was developed in a qualitative approach. The methodology used is bibliographic research, documentary research (Pedagogical Bulletin, Minutes of meetings, Institutional Evaluation Instrument) and data collection (semi-structured interviews with managers and teachers).

To develop this study, we chose to start by addressing the creation of SARESP and its phases. Following, we present the results available in the SARESP 2016 Pedagogical Bulletin and the referral identified in the schools surveyed. We also discuss how the institutional assessment is performed.

SARESP's creation context and its phases

The creation of SARESP was an initiative of São Paulo's educational policy in the Secretary of Education term of Teresa Roserley Neubauer da Silva, in the Mário Covas government. Bauer (2006) explains to us the context in which SARESP was inserted:

> The São Paulo State School Performance Assessment System (SARESP) is organized, in 1996, as an initiative, inserted in a bolder political project of the network managers, of revision and modification of the São Paulo public

---

[3] [...] *accountability* no contexto educacional significa acima de tudo a associação entre resultados de aprendizagem e consequências para o distrito educacional, a escola, os professores ou os alunos. O grau de pressão que a autoridade educacional deseja aplicar ao processo de indução pode ser calibrado de acordo com o tipo ou a seriedade das consequências. Nesse contexto, é comum rotular os níveis de pressão/indução mais altos de *high-stakes* e os mais baixos de *low-stakes*, usando a palavra inglesa *stakes*, que significa "o valor colocado em jogo pelo apostador" (BROOKE; CUNHA, 2011, p. 22).

education system announced through the document "Educational Guidelines for the State of São Paulo" from January 1995 to December 31, 1998 and published through SE Notice, 03/22/1995 (BAUER, 2006, p. 76).[4]

The author adds that this Communication from the Secretariat of Education informs that the state system needed urgent reforms because the services offered were not of quality and the management did not occur efficiently. Given the context presented, the SARESP creation would be one of the intervention strategies for facing the listed problems. SE Resolution nº 27 of March 29, 1996, defines its objective:

> - Subsidize the Secretariat of Education in decision-making on educational policy;
> - Verify the performance of students of Basic Education to provide information to all instances of the education system that support the training of human resources of the teaching profession; the reorientation of the pedagogical proposal of the schools, in order to improve it, the feasibility of the articulation of the evaluation results with the school planning, qualification and establishment of goals for the project of each school (SÃO PAULO, 1996).[5]

From what we can grasp, the intended objective was to serve as a reference for the elaboration of SEE (São Paulo State Secretariat of Education) policies and to subsidize the pedagogical work in schools.

SARESP has been conducted annually since 1996, except in 1999 and 2006, and has been modified almost every year. State schools are compulsorily evaluated, and by adhesion, private and municipal schools (with the exception of 2001 and 2002, when only state schools were evaluated).

In addition to the tests, contextualization questionnaires are also applied, with students and their families, teachers and management team. The analysis allows the grouping of the data obtained by class, then by school, later by city, municipality, regional and totaled boards for the system, that is, for the State and correlate them with student performance.

The 2006 edition was canceled by the newly sworn secretary Maria Lúcia Marcondes Vasconcelos who replaced Gabriel Chalita in charge of the São Paulo State Secretariat of

---

[4] O Sistema de Avaliação do Rendimento Escolar do Estado de São Paulo (SARESP) é organizado, em 1996, como uma iniciativa inserida em um projeto político mais ousado dos gestores de rede, de revisão e modificação do sistema educacional público paulista, anunciado através do documento "Diretrizes Educacionais para o Estado de São Paulo" no período de janeiro de 1995 a 31 de dezembro de 1998 e divulgado através do Comunicado SE, de 22/03/1995 (BAUER, 2006, p. 76).

[5] - Subsidiar a Secretaria de Educação na tomada de decisão quanto à política educacional;
- Verificar o desempenho dos alunos da Educação Básica para fornecer informações a todas as instâncias do sistema de ensino que subsidiem a capacitação dos recursos humanos do magistério; a reorientação da proposta pedagógica das escolas, de modo a aprimorá-la, a viabilização da articulação dos resultados da avaliação com o planejamento escolar, capacitação e estabelecimento de metas para o projeto de cada escola (SÃO PAULO, 1996).

Education - SEE/SP. The secretary claimed the need to analyze the results and review the way the evaluation was being developed.

In 2007, the creation of the IDESP (Portuguese initials) - São Paulo State Education Development Index was also announced.

It is also worth mentioning that in this year (2008), the results of SARESP are linked to teacher bonuses and the achievement of IDESP goals, as previously announced (Bonus for Results).

SE Resolution 41/2011, established the procedures for the realization of SARESP this year. The subjects evaluated were Portuguese Language, Mathematics, History, Geography and Writing (SÃO PAULO, 2011a).

It is also worth noting, that in 2011, Resolution No. 73/2011 instituted the "Saresp 2011" Award, which is intended for graduating students of regular high school, with the aim of encouraging greater participation and involvement of these students in Saresp assessments. The prize was 12,000 notebooks (Art. 4) (SÃO PAULO, 2011b).

In 2014, the same format was maintained, that is, the same classes evaluated, changing only the subjects of Human Sciences to Sciences (Elementary School) and Nature Sciences (Biology, Physics and Chemistry) in High School (SÃO PAULO, 2014).

In the following year, SARESP evaluated only the Portuguese Language and Mathematics subjects. We also emphasize that SARESP was census-based, covering all regular school students from all shifts in the classes/years/grades of the schools involved (3rd, 5th, 7th/6th, 9th/8th grade of Elementary School and 3rd grade of High School), except for students of the 7th grade of the elementary school of the education network of the Secretariat of Education, for which the application was by sampling (SÃO PAULO, 2015).

In 2016 and 2017, SARESP was applied to the same students and subjects of 2015. However, contextual questionnaires directed at students, teachers and schools were no longer applied, as stated in the 2017 SARESP Report, compromising the contextualization of the data measured by the applied tests.

After this brief retrospective history, we highlight the position of Calderón and Oliveira Junior (2012) who argue for the existence of three moments of SARESP in its ascending course as the main evaluation policy on a large scale. For the authors, the first period occurred between 1996 and 2002, the second period between 2003 and 2007, and the last one from 2008 (which considers until 2012).

> The first refers to their identity formation in the context of the pioneering of large-scale evaluations in Brazil. The second is characterized by managerial instability, with emphasis on changes in command at both the Secretariat of Education and the São Paulo Government. The third is characterized by stability in a context of managerial hyperpragmatism (CALDERÓN; OLIVEIRA JÚNIOR, 2012, p. 1).[6]

The last period was marked by the restructuring process of SARESP under the management of Maria Helena Guimarães Castro from 2008. Actions such as the creation of IDESP, SARESP Reference Matrices, the School Quality Program (PQE, Portuguese initials), among others, which pointed to the growing appreciation of results, particularly in the management of Governor Serra (2007-2010).

In our analysis, the growing appreciation of the results remains in Governor Alckmin's two consecutive administrations, confirming the stability of SARESP as a policy of large-scale evaluation in São Paulo, noting that in 2017, the twentieth edition of SARESP was applied. According to the SARESP 2017 Executive Summary, this edition involved 6294 schools and the publication of the "SARESP 2017 in Review" was organized.

In the following topic, we look at the 2016 SARESP results, made available in the 2016 Pedagogical Bulletin, and the data collection in four state public schools in 2017. The search for results to support educational management and reflection for Pedagogical improvement has been pursued for several years. Since its inception, SARESP has aimed to reorient the pedagogical proposal of schools in order to improve it, that is, the viability of the articulation of assessment results with school planning.

Brooke and Cunha (2015) discuss the need for reflection on the results of system evaluation by the school collective. The authors present that the Secretariats of Education try to fill this gap by issuing informative materials that attempt to make a diagnosis of students' learning level. They also highlight two materials: Pedagogical Bulletins and Reports. They also report that, even with the evolution of the quality of the Pedagogical Bulletins and in some cases, the creation of a specific day for the collective study of the feedback material returned by the school, "the dissemination of the results does not automatically result in its appropriation by the teachers" (BROOKE; CUNHA, 2015, p. 360).

Given this context, we emphasize the need for large-scale evaluations to have meaning for teachers, and therefore we question: were the results of SARESP 2016 from the 9th grade

---

[6] O primeiro se refere a sua formação identitária no contexto do pioneirismo das avaliações em larga escala no Brasil. O segundo caracteriza-se pela instabilidade gerencial, com destaque para as trocas no comando tanto na Secretaria de Educação como no Governo paulista. O terceiro caracteriza-se pela estabilidade num contexto de hiperpragmatismo gerencial (CALDERÓN; OLIVEIRA JÚNIOR, 2012, p. 1).

of elementary schools surveyed discussed between managers and teachers? What were the referrals? Do the surveyed schools conduct institutional evaluation?

The researched schools: between the planned and the accomplished

In this topic we present the results of the 2016 SARESP, from the final years of elementary school, provided by the SARESP 2016 Pedagogical Bulletin, and the referral obtained from data collection from four state schools from the western portion of the state. We also investigated whether the units surveyed perform the institutional assessment.

The baseline document, the Pedagogical Report, presents the SARESP proficiency scale at four levels of proficiency - below basic, basic, appropriate and advanced.

The below-basic level is rated as insufficient and indicates that students have insufficient mastery of content, skills and abilities desirable for the grade/year. The basic level is rated as sufficient and indicates that students demonstrate minimal mastery of content, skills and abilities, but still have the necessary structures to interact with the curriculum proposal in the subsequent grade/year. The appropriate level is rated as sufficient and indicates that students demonstrate full mastery of the content, skills and abilities desired for the school year/grade they are in. The advanced level is classified as advanced and indicates that students demonstrate knowledge and mastery of content, skills and abilities above that required for the grade/year in which they are. We present the classifications in Table 1, because according to the level of proficiency, the Pedagogical Bulletin will guide the measure to be taken as a pedagogical referral.

Table 1 - Proficiency Levels - Action to be taken

Below-basic	Intensive Recuperation
Basic	Continuing Recuperation
Appropriate	Deepening
Advanced	Challenge

Source: Author

We also highlight, Table 2, the 9th grade Performance Scale in Elementary School (from 0 to 400 points) for Portuguese Language and Mathematics which are as follows:

Table 2 – Performance Scale

	Portuguese Language	Mathematics
Below-basic	< 200	< 225
Basic	200 a < 275	225 a < 300
Appropriate	275 a < 325	300 a < 350
Advanced	< = 325	< = 350

Source: Author

After these clarifications about the SARESP proficiency scale and the 9th grade elementary school performance scale, we present the results of the four schools surveyed. For analysis of the SARESP 2016 Pedagogical Report and data collection we will randomly call it schools A, B, C and D. We inform that the schools surveyed are from a city in the western portion of the state, have a maximum of 500 students and are located in outskirts, approximately at its extremes, in the north-south and east-west directions.

In school A, the average performance in Portuguese Language was 217.7 points and in Mathematics 247.5 points. Eighty-eight students from the 9th grade attended SARESP 2016.

In school B, the average performance in Portuguese Language was 203.9 points and in Mathematics 224.7 points. 45 students from the 9th grade of SARESP 2016 participated.

In school C, the average performance in Portuguese was 261.1 and in mathematics 270.6. Fifteen students from the 9th grade of SARESP 2016 participated.

In school D, the average performance in Portuguese Language was 227.7 and in Mathematics 247.8. Fifty-eight students from the 9th grade of SARESP 2016 participated.

As can be observed in the averages presented in the four schools, we found that three of them have the basic proficiency level and only one of them, school B, in mathematics, had the proficiency level below-basic. Given these results, the pedagogical referrals would be continuing recuperation for three schools and intensive recuperation for one of them, according to the SARESP 2016 Pedagogical Bulletin (SÃO PAULO, 2017).

According to the document cited, the purpose of the SARESP Pedagogical Report is to enable the school to analyze its performance and, with the support of the State Secretariat of Education, to improve the quality of its students' learning. These results were made available to schools in early February 2017. Annual planning takes place in February and replanning in July.

In September and October 2017, we collected data from the four schools surveyed using the semi-structured interview. In school A, two managers and twelve teachers participated. In

School B, two managers and six teachers participated. School C had two managers and six teachers attending. In school D, we had the participation of a manager and eight teachers, according to the information from the manager, one manager had been cut off due to the number of students in the school. We use code AG1 to designate school manager 1, AP1, to designate school teacher 1, BG1, school manager 1, in the same way for other schools.

In the interview was asked if you had received the 2016 SARESP Pedagogical Report with the results? In school A, the managers answered yes and only teacher AP11 said "I don't remember". At school B, managers and teachers answered yes. At school C, managers and teachers answered yes. In school D, the manager answered yes and two teachers answered no (DP4, DP5).

Was it also asked if there was discussion of the 2016 SARESP results and when did it occur? School managers responded that the results of SARESP were discussed in the Collective Pedagogical Work Class (ATPC, Portuguese initials), in planning and replanning. However, we highlight that the responses were not homogeneous, two managers responded only in replanning and ATPCs. "Yes. - Replanning, ATPC(s)" (AG2). Likewise, "Yes. Replanning and ATPC" (DG1). It is worth noting that replanning occurs in July and, therefore, the continued recovery of students who had basic level of proficiency in SARESP 2016 may have been compromised. Regarding teachers, most responded that they were discussed at ATPC, in planning and replanning. Only three teachers out of 32 answered no or not present. However, the surveyed schools were asked for the minutes of the ATPC (s) and the planning and replanning meeting to verify if the results of SARESP 2016 were included as an agenda item. Only one school provided a copy of the minutes, in which it was identified as an item in the agenda of one ATPC meeting in February 2017 and the annual planning meeting. The other schools did not provide the minutes.

After that was asked which referrals, i.e., what actions were taken for the continued recovery of students who did not achieve the required learning?

Some answers from the managers:

> *The results are used every year in planning/replanning. Identifying the main difficulties are set up Action Plans every two months in ATPC. Below-basic students are referred to existing projects (Ex. Novo Mais Educação). (AG1) Continuing recuperation; learning support activities; bimonthly evaluations (simulated and their returns to students; referral of students to the Novo Mais Educação Program). (CG1)*

> *After analyzing the report cards and the reality of the school, we developed projects and action plans so that all subjects collaborate in the recovery of learning. (DG1)[7]*

Some answers from the teachers were also selected:

> *Yes, actions were collectively constructed, such as error and score analysis with students, prioritizing and identifying skills that need to be worked on in all subjects. (AP3)*
> *The first 15 days of the school year were used to retake on the skills not achieved by the students, according to the surveys passed by the coordination. (BP4)*
> *After identifying below-basic and basic level students, they are invited to take part in the recuperation activities in Mathematics and Portuguese of the Novo Mais Educação Program during the evening. By class, are identified the predominant difficulties, teachers propose in ATPC, paths and methodological strategies to work in their discipline. (CP4)*
> *I personally do not use SARESP newsletters because I believe the student gap is widespread, so there must be a change in the whole education system and not just evaluate SARESP. (DP4)[8]*

From what we could learn from the interviews, the results are presented and discussed in the schools surveyed, particularly after the results were released and in the annual planning. However, the continuing recuperation, which is the recommendation of the Pedagogical Report for students whose level of proficiency was basic, ends up being carried out in the federal government's *Novo Mais Education* Program that takes place in the opposite shift of the school hours.

We also emphasize that school B, which would refer to intensive recuperation, as the 2016 SARESP result showed a below-basic level of proficiency in the Mathematics discipline, took no further action beyond sending students to the Novo Mais Educação Program. One of the coordinators also posed an additional problem, some parents do not let their child stay in

---

[7] *Os resultados são utilizados todos os anos em planejamento/replanejamento. Identificando as principais dificuldades são montados Planos de Ações a cada bimestre em ATPC. Os alunos abaixo do básico são encaminhados para os projetos existentes (Ex.: Novo Mais Educação). (AG1)*
Recuperação continua; atividades de apoio à aprendizagem; avaliações bimestrais (simulados e suas devolutivas aos alunos; encaminhamento de alunos ao Programa Novo Mais Educação). (CG1)
Após análise dos boletins e da realidade da escola, elaboramos projetos e planos de ação para que todas as disciplinas colaborem na recuperação da aprendizagem. (DG1)

[8] *Sim foram construídas coletivamente ações como análise dos erros e acertos juntamente com os alunos, priorizando e identificando habilidades que precisam ser trabalhadas em todas as disciplinas. (AP3)*
Os 15 primeiros dias do ano letivo foi para retomar as habilidades não atingidas pelos alunos, conforme os levantamentos passados pela coordenação. (BP4)
Após identificação dos alunos de nível básico e abaixo do básico estes são convidados a participar, no contraturno, das atividades de recuperação em Matemática e Português do Programa Novo Mais Educação. Por turma são identificadas as dificuldades predominantes, os professores propõem em ATPC, formas e estratégias metodológicas para trabalhar em sua disciplina. (CP4)
Eu pessoalmente não utilizo os boletins do SARESP porque acredito que a defasagem dos alunos é generalizada, portanto deve haver uma mudança no sistema todo de ensino e não só avaliar o SARESP. (DP4)

the opposite shift, i.e., those who do not participate in the Mais Educação Program will have no recuperation alternative.

It was also interesting to know if, after the continuing recuperation process, there was a new evaluation of the students with basic and below-basic proficiency level (in school B) and if it was discussed again in the replanning? We highlight a sample of the teachers' answers:

> *Yes, results are constantly evaluated at planning meetings, ATPCs (action → reflection → action). (AP3)*
> *We did not have the opportunity to review the results after the new actions were taken. (AP7)*
> *Soon after, there was also the application of AAP – Portuguese initials – (Assessment of Learning in Process), in which it was possible to verify if the skills were contemplated or not. (BP2)*
> *Yes, shortly after the AAPs (Assessment of Learning in Process) were applied, assessing the skills not contemplated. (BP4)*
> *The results and actions are reassured all the time. It is a priority and is performed by all teachers in the class. So, the recuperation is not only responsibility of mathematics and Portuguese language teachers. (CP3)*
> *The assessment is continuous. In addition to the Learning Process Assessment (s) throughout the school year, assessments for each subject track student progress and results are discussed in ATPC and more fully in replanning. (CP4)*
> *Yes, recuperation is always done because our students have a lot of learning discrepancy, because of community history. (DP1)*
> *Yes, student recuperation was discussed in the redesign. (DP2)[9]*

In general, several of the teachers' answers are generic, that is, it does not allow the identification of a specific re-evaluation action. However, some highlighted the Learning and Process Assessment (AAP) that occurs bimonthly in the state network as a positive aspect and complementary to the results of SARESP.

We concluded the interview with the question: Does the school have institutional evaluation? Who participates and when does it occur? Of the eight managers interviewed, one

---

[9] *Sim, constantemente são avaliados os resultados em reuniões de planejamento, ATPCs (ação → reflexão → ação). (AP3)*
Não tivemos a oportunidade de rever os resultados, após traçadas as novas ações. (AP7)
Logo após, houve também a aplicação da AAP (Avaliação da Aprendizagem em Processo), na qual foi possível verificar se as habilidades foram contempladas ou não. (BP2)
Sim, logo após foi aplicado as AAPs (Avaliação da Aprendizagem em Processo), avaliando as habilidades não contempladas. (BP4)
Os resultados e ações são retomados a todo momento. É prioridade e é realizada por todos os docentes da turma. Não ficando a recuperação somente a cargo dos professores de Matemática e Língua Portuguesa. (CP3)
A avaliação é contínua. Além da(s) Avaliação(ões) Aprendizagem Processo (AAPs) ao longo do ano letivo, as avaliações de cada disciplina acompanham o progresso dos alunos e os resultados são discutidos em ATPC e de forma mais completa no replanejamento. (CP4)
Sim, sempre é feito a recuperação, pois nossos alunos têm muita defasagem no aprendizado pelo histórico da comunidade. (DP1)
Sim, a recuperação dos alunos foi discutida no replanejamento. (DP2)

said he did not know, he was in another school, one answered that they were conducting the Learning in Process Assessment (AAP) and the others answered yes and that the assessment sent by the Board of Education was used. Regarding the teachers, most answered yes and that occurred on the last day of the year and used the instrument provided by the school board. Only four teachers said they did not know. Only two teachers from the same school (school A) answered differently: "9th grade and 3rd grade students always participated in September" (AP7) and "We would like to elaborate and one of the questions we listed was: self-assessment that prof. X (Arts) already applies to the Y Foundation. To be extended to other years as a way of knowing better and more deeply our clients" (AP10). Thus, only one school referred to another model of institutional evaluation that does not use the model of the Board of Education.

From what we could learn, the schools surveyed use the "Institutional Evaluation Instrument" sent by the Board of Education with five dimensions to be evaluated: pedagogical dimension, participatory management, human resources management, physical and financial resources management and educational results management. The document (a questionnaire) has nine pages with discursive questions and includes Directors, Deputy Directors, Coordinating Professor(s) and Teachers. As the institutional assessment is carried out, the schools surveyed make the last day of school available for this purpose and it seems to us that it occurs bureaucratically. Sousa (1995) who defines Institutional Evaluation as

> [...] a process of seeking understanding of the school reality, with the purpose of subsidizing the decision making regarding the direction of the interventions, aiming at the improvement of the school work. As such, the evaluation comprises the description, interpretation and judgment of the actions developed, resulting in the definition of priorities to be implemented and directions to be followed, having as reference the principles and purposes established in the school project, while subsidizing its own implementation (SOUSA, 1995, p. 63).[10]

Therefore, what has been identified is completely different from what we understand by institutional evaluation.

---

[10] [...] um processo de busca de compreensão da realidade escolar, com o fim de subsidiar a tomada de decisão quanto ao direcionamento das intervenções, visando ao aprimoramento do trabalho escolar. Como tal, a avaliação compreende a descrição, interpretação e o julgamento das ações desenvolvidas, resultando na definição de prioridades a serem implementadas e rumos a serem seguidos, tendo como referência princípios e finalidades estabelecidos no projeto da escola, ao tempo em que subsidia a sua própria definição (SOUSA, 1995, p. 63).

Final considerations

According to interviews in the schools surveyed, the recuperation of students with proficiency in basic or below-basic on SARESP, seemed to us to be restricted to teachers of the Portuguese Language and Mathematics subjects. The SARESP 2016 Education Bulletin indicates continuing recuperation for basic proficiency and intensive recuperation for below-basic proficiency. In the school with below-basic proficiency in the Mathematics discipline no intensive recuperation action was identified. In the other schools, continuing recuperation was offered in the *Novo Mais Educação* Program, which is carried out by another teacher during the opposite shift. We identified in one of the schools that the math subject teacher could not meet with the recuperation teacher. He had classes at another school and the schedules were incompatible. We also add the information that some parents do not allow students to stay in the other shift and therefore are left without recuperation. It was also evidenced that in Replanning there is no specific action, that is, a new evaluation to support the recuperation process. Although some teachers have mentioned the Learning and Process Assessment (AAP) as complementary to the SARESP results.

Finally, these aspects end up compromising the "real" recuperation of students who have a proficiency level below-basic or basic. Similarly, what is termed institutional assessment does not "really" consist in a process of seeking to understand school reality. We identified the need for institutional evaluation, that is, the school collective, to analyze the results of the system evaluation, to look at these data, validate them and find ways of referral to the teacher, in order to offer subsidies for classroom evaluation. We emphasize on institutional assessment on the results of system assessment to monitor/support student learning. However, we emphasize the need for other qualitative indicators listed by the collective that contribute to the rescue of the school's purpose and that can support school management.

REFERENCES

ARCAS, P. H. **Implicações da progressão continuada e do SARESP na avaliação escolar:** tensões, dilemas e tendências. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2009.

BAUER, A. **Usos dos resultados do SARESP:** o papel da avaliação nas políticas de formação docente. 2006. 172 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação), Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, 2006.

BAUER, A. Uso dos Resultados do SARESP e Formação de Professores: a visão dos níveis centrais. *In:* BROOKE, N.; ALVES, M. T. G.; OLIVEIRA, L. K. M. (orgs.) **A Avaliação da Educação Básica:** a experiência brasileira. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço, p. 381-386, 2017.

BAUER, A; SOUSA, S. Z. L.; HORTA NT, J. L.; VALLE, R.; PIMENTA, C. O. Iniciativas de avaliação do ensino fundamental em municípios brasileiros: mapeamento e tendências. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 22, p. 1-19, 2017.

BROOKE, N.; CUNHA, M. A. A avaliação externa como instrumento da gestão educacional nos estados. **Estudos & Pesquisas Educacionais,** v. 2, p. 17–79, 2011.

BROOKE, N.; CUNHA, M. A Avaliação Externa como Instrumento da Gestão Educacional nos Estados. *In:* BROOKE, N.; ALVES, M. T. G.; OLIVEIRA, L. K. M. (orgs.) **A Avaliação da Educação Básica:** a experiência brasileira. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço, p. 359-364, 2015.

CALDERÓN, A. I.; OLIVEIRA JUNIOR, R. G. Sistema de avaliação e rendimento escolar do estado de São Paulo: uma abordagem na linha do tempo. *In:* III III Congresso Ibero Americano de Política e Administração da Educação, 2012, Zaragoza. **Cadernos ANPAE.** Recife: Biblioteca ANPAE, v. 15. p. 1-16, 2012.

CAPOCCHI. E. R. **Avaliações em larga escala e políticas de responsabilização na educação:** evidências de implicações indesejadas no Brasil. 214 p. 2017. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação). Faculdade de Educação da universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2017.

EVERS, Williamson M.; WALBERG, Herbert J. **School accountability.** Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2002.

RAVITCH, D. Testing and Accountability Historically Considered. *In:* EVERS, Williamson M.; WALBERG, H. J. **School accountability.** Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, p. 9-22, 2002.

SÃO PAULO. SEE. **Resolução SE n. 27, de 29 de março de 1996**. Dispõe sobre o Sistema de Avaliação de Rendimento Escolar do Estado de São Paulo. Disponível em: http://siau.edunet.sp.gov.br/ItemLise/arquivos/27_1996.htm. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2017.

SÃO PAULO. **Lei Complementar n. 1078,** de 17 de dezembro de 2008. Institui a Bonificação por Resultados- BR, no âmbito da Secretaria da Educação. Disponível em: http://www.legislacao.sp.gov.br/legislacao/dg280202.nsf/6279925b177ee40183256b6f00692f 13/a2898744a65659d903257523004bf8c1?OpenDocument. Acesso em: 31 jan. 2018.

SÃO PAULO. **Resolução SE n. 41,** de 31 de julho de 2014**.** Dispõe sobre a realização das provas de avaliação relativas ao Sistema de Avaliação de Rendimento Escolar do Estado de São Paulo – SARESP/2014. Disponível em: http://file.fde.sp.gov.br/saresp/saresp2014/Arquivos/Resolu%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20SE%204 1_14_SARESP2014.pdf. Acesso em: 31 jan. 2019.

SÃO PAULO. **Resolução SE n. 41,** de 18 de agosto de 2015. Dispõe sobre a realização das provas de avaliação relativas ao Sistema de Avaliação de Rendimento Escolar do Estado de São Paulo – SARESP/2015. Disponível em:

http://file.fde.sp.gov.br/saresp/saresp2015/Arquivos/RESOLU%C3%87%C3%83O_SE_41_S
ARESP_2015.pdf. Acesso em: 31. jan. 2018.

SÃO PAULO. **Boletim Pedagógico do SARESP de 2016**. Disponível em:
http://saresp.fde.sp.gov.br/2016/ Acesso em 20 jul. 2017.

SÃO PAULO. **Sumário Executivo do SARESP 2017**. Disponível em:
http://saresp.fde.sp.gov.br/2017/Arquivos/sumario_executivo_15_junho.pdf. Acesso em: 31
jan. 209.

SÃO PAULO. **IDESP**. Disponível em: http://www.educacao.sp.gov.br/idesp Acesso em 28
maio 2018.

SOUSA. S. Z. **Avaliação escolar**: constatações e perspectivas. **Revista de Educação AEC**,
Brasília: AEC do Brasil, ano 24, n. 94, p. 59-66, jan./mar. 1995.

How to quote this article