

THE SPECIALIZED EDUCATIONAL UNIT CONSIDERING SPECIAL EDUCATION AND COUNTRYSIDE EDUCATION

A UNIDADE EDUCACIONAL ESPECIALIZADA CONSIDERANDO-SE A EDUCAÇÃO ESPECIAL E A EDUCAÇÃO DO CAMPO

LA UNIDAD EDUCATIVA ESPECIALIZADA CON BASE A LA EDUCACIÓN ESPECIAL Y LA EDUCACIÓN RURAL

Ana Cristina de Sousa dos SANTOS¹
Ana Paula Cunha dos Santos FERNANDES²

ABSTRACT: This qualitative field research analyzes the pedagogical practices of teachers with riverside children in a Specialized Educational Unit (SEU), emphasizing its physical structure and elements of riverside culture in its attendance/class, in the city of Belém, capital of Pará state. The partial results of the research at SEU show projects and programs aimed at students with disabilities. The research participants were the specialized professors that compose the faculty of SEU programs. In the results, it is highlighted that the SEU had to redefine its programs and projects under the guidelines of the specialized educational attendance (SEA); despite being renovated, the unit faces difficulties in managing scarce resources and roaming services almost always take place in precarious spaces; there are students with disabilities who are not in regular classrooms and attention is still focused on the disabilities themselves; there are few teachers who carry out pedagogical practices contextualized to rural/riverside students.

KEYWORDS: Specialized unit. Student with disability. Special education. Education field. Ribeirinhos.

RESUMO: Esta pesquisa qualitativa de campo, analisa as práticas pedagógicas de professores com crianças ribeirinhas em uma Unidade Educacional Especializada (UEE), enfatizando-se sua estrutura física e os elementos da cultura ribeirinha em seus atendimentos/aula, na cidade de Belém do Pará. Os resultados parciais da pesquisa na UEE mostram projetos e programas voltados aos alunos com deficiência. Os participantes da pesquisa foram os professores especializados que compõem os programas da UEE. Nos resultados, destaca-se que a UEE teve que redefinir seus programas e projetos sob as diretrizes do atendimento educacional especializado (AEE); apesar da reformada, a unidade enfrenta dificuldades no gerenciamento dos recursos escassos e, os atendimentos em itinerância acontecem, quase sempre, em espaços precários; há estudantes com deficiência que não estão em salas regulares e, as atenções ainda estão voltadas para as deficiências em si; há poucos

¹ Pará State University (UEPA), Belém – PA – Brazil. Master's Student of the Graduate Program in Education, Teacher Training and Pedagogical Practices /2019 – PPGED. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0816-5294>. E-mail: crissbrabo@gmail.com

² Pará State University (UEPA), Belém – PA – Brazil. Professor at undergraduate and graduate levels, Department of Specialized Education. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1934-9221>. E-mail: docenteapf@gmail.com

professores que exercem práticas pedagógicas contextualizadas aos alunos e alunas do campo/ribeirinho(a)s.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Unidade especializada. Estudante com deficiência. Educação especial. Educação do campo. Ribeirinhos.*

RESUMEN: *Esta investigación cualitativa de campo, analiza las prácticas pedagógicas de los profesores com niños ribereños en una Unidad Educativa Especializada (UEE), destacando su estructura física y su estructura física y los elementos de la cultura ribereña en su cuidado/clase, en la ciudad de Belém do Pará. Los resultados parciales de la investigación en la UEE muestran proyectos y programas dirigidos a estudiantes con discapacidades. Los participantes en la investigación fueron los profesores especializados que componen los programas de la UEE. En los resultados, destaca que la UEE tuvo que redefinir sus programas y proyectos bajo las directrices de atención educativa especializada (AEE); a pesar de reformada, la unidad enfrenta dificultades en la gestión de los escasos recursos y los servicios itinerantes ocurren casi siempre en espacios precarios; hay alumnos con discapacidades que no están en aulas ordinarias y la atención se sigue centrando en las propias discapacidades; hay pocos profesores que ejercen prácticas pedagógicas contextualizadas a los alumnos y estudiantes del campo/rio(s).*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Unidad especializada. Estudiante con discapacidades. Educación especial. La educación en el campo. Habitantes del río.*

Introduction

This article is a cut of the master's research "Pedagogical teaching practices with riverine students in a specialized institution", since 2019, in a Specialized Educational Unit (SEU) in the city of Belém, Pará, governed by the State Department of Education (SEDUC) of this state that works with the public of Special Education, These are people with blindness and low vision associated or not with other disabilities and/or comorbidities, who can have their specialized educational service (SES) weekly, monthly or over a longer period, depending on the distance between home and SEU. Thus, the present work will include part of the data from this research in the SEU.

This qualitative study aims to analyze the pedagogical practices of teachers with riverine children who attend this SEU, emphasizing its physical structure and the elements of riverine culture in their care/class, in the city of Belém, Pará.

The article is organized as follows: in section 2, there is a discussion about special education and its unfoldings to other subareas such as field education and, in relation to the specialized school; in section 3, it brings the methodology related to the organization of the studies, which provide an opportunity to verify the pedagogical practices of teachers with

riverine children who attend the SEU; section 4, brings the presentation of the SEU concomitant to the discussions and results with emphasis on pedagogical practices of teachers of riverine children in the SEU and its possible cultural elements and; finally, the final considerations, in which we realize that there are few teachers who exercise contextualized pedagogical practices to students from the field / riverine(s), which leads to the reflection of the need for discussions and training of teachers of special education regarding other modalities and/or themes of school education.

Special Education and the SEU in issues pertaining to Field Education

The Law of Directives and Bases of National Education - LDBEN no. 9.394/1996 (BRAZIL, 1996), defines, in addition to levels and stages of school education in the country, the modalities, among them special education. Thus, as a component of education, it has, according to Almeida (2018), the political dimension, relevant to the function of training man in the elaboration of his knowledge for his individual, collective and social construction, which can transform society.

In this sense, the SES with all its guidelines (BRAZIL, 2009), is an important component of the Inclusive Education policy in the country and is configured as a class, although in different format(s) from those that occur in regular classrooms and other pedagogical spaces in the school.

With this, it is necessary to discuss its political meaning as a component of a modality that carries, in its history, stories of exclusion, invisibility, and silencing in relation to other modalities, levels, and stages of education. Almeida (2018), citing Nicolescu (2005), reminds us that for a proper understanding of the world, it is urgent for human beings to build a transcultural dialogue.

In this, it is understood that thinking about special education for a differentiated work with riverine/campesino students is to begin to break the barrier of compartmentalized knowledge areas to give way to the conjunction of which Almeida (2018) reminds us in relation to the knowledge and indivisible characteristics that form human beings, as advocated by Fernandes and Santos (2021, p. 2), "in a more integral way and not with ruptures" in order to make dialogue and contextual valuation of each student effective, as announced by Freire (1987) and safeguarded in the LDBEN in force (BRAZIL, 1996).

The special education public³ permeates all stages, levels and other modalities of education and should, therefore, pay attention to the specificity of each student according to this classification. Still, it is verified that, by Decree No. 7.352/2010 (BRAZIL, 2010), it is present in all the groups that form the countryside people, such as river dwellers, which are research interests. Moreover, it is seen that special education is referenced as its own dialogue with rural education, in the National Policy of Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, which cites the "interface of special education in indigenous, rural (countryside) and *quilombola* education [...]" (BRAZIL, 2008, p. 17).

In this way, there are countless developments between them, leaving room for interpretation that such groups - which are mobile and, for a series of situations, are not fixed in the territories of the countryside - have the right to receive education according to their cultures in any places where they can get it. Thus, it is possible to interpret that the mobility of peasant collectives makes them take their rights to have a school education with, at least, a synthesis of the principles of the countryside school to other spaces that receive them, a critical intercultural education of their contexts, as argued by Candau (2008). It is in this way that it is understood that special education in specialized schools cannot evade this debate and this challenge.

Lozano (2019), citing Alves (2008), reinforces the need for socialization and sharing in heterogeneity as an inalienable human right, as well as reminding that, for a long time, this was denied to people with disabilities. Thus, to deprive them of the wider social interaction with their community and send them to special schools is to go against these hard-won rights, which are based on the difference that transforms. However, with the new inclusive education policy, the SEU becomes a space to support and promote inclusion. However, the silencing of their ways of life, the little group coexistence and the lack of dialogue with the community of rural students in the specialized school may be a way to deprive these students of their rights.

The SEU has existed since the mid-twentieth century, when medical-therapeutic care was introduced. Then, it migrated to integration and then to the perspective of inclusion where the units in question participate in the condition of Multifunctional Resource Room and Specialized Educational Attendance for funding issues (LIMA; LINHARES, 2017).

Thus, properly historically contextualized, it is certified that a specialized institution with a Political-Pedagogical Project (PPP) well structured collectively and with teachers with pedagogical practices firmed in the attention to the sociocultural context of their students, will

³ This audience is composed of students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders and/or high abilities/giftedness (BRAZIL, 2008).

act more assertively, in order to safeguard the rights of these people, such as having field education with resource rooms in their own peasant/riverine territories.

Therefore, the pedagogical practices of teachers need to be grounded in the conception conquered by the rural people as, in the words of Arroyo and Fernandes (1999), new social and cultural subjects, in such a way that "we dynamize the school, with our pedagogical action to follow the dynamics of the field" (ARROYO; FERNANDES, 1999, p. 19). Thus, for riverside students with disabilities, the SEU becomes the only or one more of these spaces for reflection of their worlds and other knowledge in their lives, even if it is outside their territories.

Moreover, riverine children with disabilities, as an indivisible being, in the view of Fernandes (2020) citing Fernandes and Fernandes (2020), promote the fusion of Early Childhood Education, Special Education and Field Education in a unary way, as a hybridization, without suppression or imposition. A fact that makes us reflect that these children, with all the aspects that form their identities (even if in transit, given the proximity of some of them who live near the city of Belém) go beyond their territories for various reasons and carry with them the right to have their conceptions of life emphasized and their cultures valued and problematized in their different forms of *modus vivendi*.

And also, each disabled riverine child who attends school, whether regular or specialized, based on the principles of special education itself, is unique and, in its time, has the ability to understand the issues related to their region, culture, and world. Otherwise, we would still be sticking to the culture of disability that understood PwD students as a whole deficient and limited in the 1990s, as cited in the National Curriculum Parameters (PCN) when talking about curricular flexibility (BRAZIL, 1998).

Leite Filho (2013) reminds that children as social and cultural subjects affect and are affected by their contexts. In this context, as riverine children with disabilities, they are produced and produce culture in a continuum of plural and unique humanity, which requires attention from the whole school. Thus, among other issues of these children to be considered, we corroborate with Frota (2021) when he points out that, regardless of time, culture and social class, games and toys are part of the child's life, in a symbiosis of fantasy and reality whose teaching cannot forget.

Methodological Procedures

The present research had a qualitative approach, in which it "takes into account that the points of view, and practices in the field are different due to the various perspectives and social contexts related to them" (FLICK 2009, p.24-25). Thus, the research locus - a specialized school - falls within this universe when it "uses text as empirical material, starts from the notion of social construction of the realities under study, is interested in the perspectives of the participants, in their day-to-day practices and in their everyday knowledge concerning the issue under study" (FLICK, 2009, p. 16).

To carry out the studies, we defined the Education program with teachers who work in the early intervention, alpha braille, pedagogical intervention and socio-psychopedagogical sector of the SEU that belongs to the state network, in the city of Belém - PA and serves students with blindness and low vision, in three programs: education, habilitation/rehabilitation, and specialized educational support. The choice of this SEU was due to the fact that, besides being public, it receives riverside students and Pará is the state that stands out in the studies on special education and rural education interface, thus becoming interesting to analyze the teaching practices with these groups in the capital, Belém.

The study favors a deeper analysis of the aspects that permeate the pedagogical practices of special education teachers. And exploratory, through field research, which is "the cut that the researcher makes in terms of space, in an empirical reality to be studied from the theoretical conceptions that underlie the object of investigation" (MINAYO 1994, p. 53). In other words, the researcher defines an area to discuss the research theory with greater familiarity and then draws pertinent information from there.

The criteria for the selection of research participants were: a) to work in special education and have involvement with the values of this modality, according to the inclusive education policy; b) to be a teacher who works in this locus with the disabled public of the field education in the riverine typification; c) to be available for the research. The techniques used for data collection were: semi-structured interviews with two teachers and one teacher, as well as the observation of the school context registered in a field journal and in pictures/images.

In the field diary, in addition to details such as date, room where the interviews were carried out and the days of observation of the appointments/classrooms with start and finish, age and behavior of the riverside children, observations were recorded for the data collection process, in addition to the good and/or bad aspects of the physical infrastructure of the SEU, the behavior and/or practices of the teachers and management during and after the semi-

structured interviews that served to complement and/or confront the statements of the participants.

These teachers were all specialists in special education, aged between 45 and 60 years and with time of service in this area from 24 to 25 years and have been working with riverine students with disabilities between 22 and 24 years and received, in random order of interviews, fictitious names to protect their identities. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Universidade Estadual do Pará - UEPA and is registered under number CAEE: 24817619.8.0000.5174.

For data analysis, categories were created that emerged from the participants' speeches. Thus, after transcribing their speeches, the material was organized in order to facilitate the study in parts. Thus, it is understood that the categorization process consists, according to Oliveira and Mota Neto (2011), in the logical organization of the collected data, enabling an organized and integrated structure for research analysis. In the next section, it is presented the results and discussions of the research.

The Specialized Unit - Discussions and Results

The pedagogical practice of the teacher is impacted by the structure and operation of the school and reflects on the learning of students with disabilities (FERNANDES; OLIVEIRA, 2020). Thus, it is understood the relevance of addressing the infrastructure and pedagogical practices in the SEU

Initially, we emphasize the importance of space in the UEE and the impact on the student's life and identity. Thus, Moranta and Urrútia (2005, p. 281) describe that the links that people establish with these spaces have been the subject of analysis from multiple perspectives. Therefore, to talk about the appropriation of space in its diversity is to express bond or affective value (JERÔNIMO; GONÇALVES, 2008; MARTINS; GONÇALVES, 2014).

In agreement with Arcaro and Gonçalves (2012), each subject appropriates a place in a different way, depending, therefore, on cultural, social models, lifestyle, among others. It is important to highlight that there is an interaction impregnated with subjectivity, where one builds a brand, a representative symbol that makes the environment familiar, personal, intimate, thus building an identity to the place. Hence, the need for the environment to be receptive and to exhale the distinct cultures that pass through its space.

The SEU locus has more than 60 years of existence and receives students of any age group, whether they are in regular schools or not. The SEU, in its disability attendance

specification, is unique in the state of Pará. Its structure is all in masonry on its two floors; it has building accessibility with an access ramp to the second floor, tactile floors and hallways, information boards in Braille and Libras code, wide doors to rooms and other spaces, preferential bathrooms, rooms with slightly contrasting paintings, etc. However, no elements such as paintings, sculptures, plant arrangements, etc., were observed to highlight the cultures of the riverside and/or rural students who attend the school.

The SEU operates through programs, sectors and projects that present educational proposals aimed both at the area of education and at the habilitation/rehabilitation of the person with primary and/or associated disabilities, but, curiously enough, they are all considered SES. The SEU, which obeys the standards of school days, physical and administrative structure determined by the State Special Education Coordinator - COEES/SEDUC-PA, becomes a reference not only for being unique in the State of Pará and, thus, standing out in its activities, but, for its contemporary infrastructure and full staff of specialist teachers.

In 2019, according to data from the SEU secretariat, the SEU itself (UEE in the Brazilian Portuguese acronym) served 300 students of which, 42 were from the countryside. Of the total number of rural students, 26 were from the riverside area and, of these, 12 were children from 3 to 12 years old who, according to the pedagogical coordination, when they were attending regular schools, were attended after school and, consequently, had losses in regular classes on these days, since they were not in schools near their homes. There are also students from the countryside/riverine who live very far away and, who stay in the city from two to three days each month and, in this period, receive the care/class intensively in one or two shifts, bringing the reflection of how much special education, at least in the format of Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs) needs to be implemented in the countryside schools as a right already established to these students.

The SEU has signaling with metal plates in Braille on all doors; tactile floor and wall markers throughout the school (except in the cafeteria); 190 sets of desks (left and right); 23 computers with adapters and with the implementation of voice software made by the management team; 38 air conditioners, Wi-Fi internet system throughout the building. Such acquisitions, considered the minimum necessary for the activities to function, would be colossal if we implemented at least one MRR along these lines in a rural territory.

The assistance/class in the SEU programs takes place once or twice a week, lasting forty-five minutes for each student, except for those with serious associated disabilities, which happens according to their level of tolerance, and for some students from the countryside who

live very far away and who stay direct two shifts for up to a week (since they will only return one or two months later).

For the proper analysis of the pedagogical practices of teachers of the riverine children, questions were asked, after authorization of the project by the CEP/UEPA and authorization of the management of the SEU, in semi-structured interviews and informally in moments of observation, which emphasized the organization of their planning to the contexts of riverine students and the use of elements of riverine culture in their care. According to the teachers of each sector studied, there is a specific target audience, in which each one has its annual planning, and, initially, an Individualized Pedagogical Plan (IPP) is made in a standard form for each student who will attend that space. The teachers, whose names are fictitious, thus referred to the sector plan and/or the IPP:

We have the proposal of each sector that is the annual planning and more the daily records and reports. And the daily planning, in this case, we have in addition to this sector planning, the so-called IPP, which is the Individual Pedagogical Plan, which is for each student (TEACHER RAY, 2019). I prepare a specific planning for each student. Even because we have a small number of students: the IPP. But, this individual elaboration is much more due to the visual issue. Because each student has a specific, unique visual perception (TEACHER SABÁ, 2020).

The second participant says that "*the planning is done according to the disabilities, so yes, each one will have a specific planning*" (TEACHER BENA, 2019). In other words, teachers prepare the IPP for each of their students based on a SEU's own form. It is noted in the statements of teacher Sabá and teacher Bena that planning is still centered on concerns with disability only. Neres (2010) warns against planning without guidance or with decontextualized guidance, at the risk of fragmentation or the establishment of contents with little meaning to students, thus weakening the access to world knowledge.

In addition to the existing programs in the SEU, there are the services provided externally, which take place at the Higher School of Physical Education, where sports activities are performed, such as swimming, running, golf, etc., at the State Integrated Center for Inclusion and Citizenship - CIIC, where clinical-therapeutic care is provided, and there are the itinerant services that serve regular schools. The latter, according to teachers' reports, are often improvised, since, even if they go to schools in the city to provide specialized care, many of them do not have MRR or have them precariously.

With the expansion of the SEU in the recent reform, new rooms appeared, making it possible to offer new services and, with the reformulation of its documents, the SEU became

totally a space for specialized educational care. The management team explains the situation, which is noted in the diary, about this service permeating all students, regardless of whether or not they are in regular school:

The new inclusion policy provides the opportunity to make this adjustment in order to keep the space standing with the second enrollment. It is necessary to welcome everyone, verify their potentialities, work on them, see the possibilities of completing their education, even analyzing specific terminology for them, if that is the case. But we are already studying the possibility of forming an YAE (Youth and Adult Education) class in the SEU itself so that both parties can benefit from the relationship (Field Diary, November 19, 2019).

In the excerpt, it can be seen that the SEU has made a point of taking all of its students as the SES audience. This, in the words of the staff, was necessary in the reformulation of its current system, because in this way it achieves dual enrollment for the maximum number of students. It is a way to fight for its maintenance in spite of the law that relegates it to a simple support and without greater justification for acquiring funds in other ways. In fact, they are already thinking of forming Youth and Adult Education (YAE) classes in order to get more money, that is, for the first and second enrollment of those who are not attending regular schools, but are attending the SEU.

However, between the lines, one can see that the disputes for funds with the regular school only increase when other strategies are sought for the acquisition of the first and second enrollment and, again, leave the specialized school as the promoter of segregation of these students, since they will not socialize with the other students of the regular school. However, the discourse that persists is that the fight for its maintenance does not make it, so far, insensitive to the point of not welcoming those who are outside the regular education system. And there are riverside and rural students, in general, in this situation. Thus, it remains for us to know if the reception inside the school is being contextual and inclusive.

The pedagogical practices of the teachers of the specialized unit with the riverine students

The pedagogical structure of the SEU is organized according to the ideas of curricular complementation and adaptation for the SES. Curricular adaptation still appears as an elementary idea - although it should no longer be in use, given the current understanding of accessibility and curricular differentiation to contemplate all students and eliminate barriers - since it was a proposal that provided knowledge to students in a simplified way, but did not contemplate the curriculum in its entirety (MIRANDA, 2021). For a better understanding of

this pedagogical structure under the aegis of the SES, a chart with a summary of its operation is organized below:

Chart 1 – Pedagogical organization in the PPP

SPECIALIZED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE			
SUPPORT FOR SEU ACTIONS	PROGRAMS	SECTORS/SCOPE	PROJECTS AND SUBPROJECTS
Specialized Educational Technical Service: - Psychology; - Social service; - Speech therapy.	Education Program	-Early intervention; -Alpha Braille; -Pedagogical Intervention; -Educational Informatics; -Sociopsychopedagogical.	I. Students with Low Vision: a challenging look towards inclusion. 1) Getting to know my child better; 2) Knowing Low Vision; 3) Knowing, practicing and thinking: paths to inclusion; 4) Walking together with the visually impaired person. II. Sporting Modalities: 1) Golball; 2) Athletics; 3) Swimming. III. Quality of life of visually impaired people over 60 years old at SEU José Álvares de Azevedo.
	Habilitation/Rehabilitation Program	-Activity of Autonomous and Social Life; -Orientation and Mobility; -Communication; -Low Vision.	
	Specialized Educational Support Program	-Toy library; -Education; Physics/Psychomotricity; - Arts Center (Plastic and Musical); - Itinerant Education; -Braille Production and Reproduction Nucleus; -Pedagogical complementation; -Library.	

Source: Documentary research - Internal Regulations (2016; 2015)

In the table, it can be seen that the SEU assumes itself as a space for education with the main mission of providing SES through programs, sectors, projects and subprojects. Thus, a necessary dialogue is understood between the special education modality and others such as field education and the school itself. These issues must be very clear for the SEU teacher, because many still divide or limit their duties by area or subarea. A noticeable fact in the teachers' statements when asked if they put in their planning curriculum issues specific to the cultural contexts of their riverine students:

Usually the curriculum (choke) to be worked on here has a lot to do with the culture in general, of the city itself. For example, we talk about a commemorative date: Brazil's independence, as it is something like that that is being talked about(...) in the very school where he studies (...), the meaning of the history of the flag, the colors, for example, even with the blind student, I can talk about colors, talk by association (...) (TEACHER RAY, 2019).
Usually who will work the school curriculum is the regular teacher, I am not a classroom teacher, I am a resource teacher (...). So, I work the resource room's own curriculum, it's libras, braille, psychomotricity, to develop this student (...). So, we can work culture when it is a music activity, which is

within the curriculum, or when we work on certain themes (TEACHER BENA, 2019).

We make this relationship to try to adapt the visual training to that student... Otherwise, it is something very distant from him and, as we need to train visual perception, we need direct answers, right answers, he can not be in doubt about what is being asked (TEACHER SABÁ, 2020).

From the speeches of these professionals, we can see a mix of very different teaching practices: teacher Ray tries to explain that she is in line with what the regular school offers and says that the UEE is more attentive to "culture in general", and uses practices that are favorable to the understanding of disability (in this case, she teaches colors to the student with blindness by association); teacher Bena puts the cultural responsibility on the regular classroom teacher and defines the curriculum by subareas related to the resource room: libras, braille, psychomotricity, or, works according to the theme of the moment; teacher Sabá, in turn, states that she tries to adapt the work of visual training to the student's culture, so as not to be so distant from him. However, her goal is to train the student's visual perception.

Neres (2010), when talking about the de-contextualized planning based only in the disability, points out that Mendes (2008) records in his research that the disability in specialized schools, not rarely, is still conceived as an obstacle, a difficulty that must, *a priori*, be overcome so that the students may then have access to knowledge. According to Neres (2010), this fact subjects the "philosophy of the specialized" to the idea of normalization.

However, by the pedagogical organization chart of the PPP (2015), it can be seen that the teachers do not organize their planning by the westernized universal knowledge so criticized nowadays, because they have curricular autonomy with interesting themes verified in the implementation of their projects and subprojects and work in interconnection with more customary areas such as sports and family. However, the SEU still does not have any project that works with the cultures of the rural/riverine people and that empowers them as differentiated cultures, even if in movement, since it is a school that is in the city. Questioning the pedagogical coordination about the aforementioned cultural fair that used to take place years ago and is no longer happening, we obtained the following annotated in the field diary:

The school held the fair until 2013. In 2014 there was a proposal to relocate the school to another space and it was not possible. From 2015 to 2018 there was a renovation and the SEU was in an improvised, cramped space, so it couldn't happen again. Then, in 2019 the school was being organized again, but with the uproar of the Covid - 19 pandemic, the fair will not take place (Field Diary, November 20, 2019).

However, by informal reports of teachers, it was observed that the cultural fair works the Paraense culture in general, without referring to the specificities of the municipalities and riverside communities. Even so, this fact, despite the criticism of many researchers to sporadic events, has great relevance, since the students, in general, like the gastronomy (açai, flour, tapioca, etc.) and the toys that are emphasized in the fair and are used all year round in the attendance spaces.

In general, during the research period, it was possible to notice that the teachers who base their practices in the contexts of the riverside children are still few. And, when they do, they use elements of Pará culture in their toys and educational games or insert in activities, elements of riverside life such as canoe, river, fish, açai etc., but without further dialogues about these activities and connections with the identity of place that also contemplates the person.

Thus, according to Candau (2008), the school embraces an intercultural perspective to promote an education for the recognition of the "other", for the dialogue between different sociocultural groups. However, it was not possible to observe, perhaps due to the pandemic period, if more intense critical intercultural processes of the kind defined by Candau (2008, p. 52) that "confronts the conflicts caused by the asymmetry of power between different sociocultural groups" occur in the SEU.

In general, it was observed that there are still teachers, even special education specialists, who have difficulty in establishing practices that value differences in their various social and/or identity markers, as is the case of riverside children with disabilities and, thus, transpose them to the limits of the most usual practices almost automated in their profession for those that emerge to form the wholeness of each student.

Final remarks

The article analyzed the elements that support the pedagogical practices of teachers of riverine children in a specialized educational unit, emphasizing its physical structure and the use of elements of riverine culture in their care. Among the issues identified, emphasis was given to the understanding of special education extending its action to other areas and/or modalities, such as rural/riverine education in its intercultural processes in relation to the SEU; the presentation of the SEU with its infra and supra structure and its modes of operation, concomitant to the discussions and results with emphasis on the pedagogical practices of teachers of riverine children, for understanding that, although there is a SEU in a building all refurbished and accessible - logistically and physically, and with specialist teachers, the issues

of cultural diversities, the dialogue with the modality of rural education, with cultural/contextual issues still leaves much to be desired.

It is understood that if the SEU, which has enrollments of students with disabilities from rural territories (riverine, *quilombola*, indigenous, etc.), should contemplate their cultures in respect to their identity(ies) and, in consideration to what is proposed in official documents about the school for all, where it is possible to generate bonds, affections, that produce life impact, among others, in its structure and that contemplates the pedagogical practices.

Nevertheless, the responsibilities for the interface work are not only for teachers or schools. The educational systems need to approach the inter-sectorial exchanges and activities, mainly so that the teachers' praxis does not remain solely based on the specific issues of disability. It is necessary to invest in pedagogical materials and in a permanent and humanistic training that increasingly favors the students' protagonism.

Therefore, it is pertinent to deepen the educational issues in the several realities through which the rural/riverine students with disabilities go through; as an example, we can mention the pedagogical practices they receive in the city of Belém in the specialized units and in the regular schools, the dialogical approach of the schools with the social movements and communities of these students etc.

Therefore, it is opportune the promotion and/or amplification of transdisciplinary and transcultural dialogues that provide the opportunity for debates about an education with a praxis adequate to the regional realities and specificities of the field/riverine, including those of Special Education professionals. Dialogues that inspire schools to pay attention not only to their architectural structure, resources, political-pedagogical project, or curricular organization, but also to methodologies, pedagogical practices, etc., that come to institute, in fact, a new/another culture of education for diversity as an expression of education that contributes to more egalitarian and democratic societies.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, L. S. C. **Educação Inclusiva no Campo: realidades e desafios no contexto escolar em Presidente Figueiredo no Amazonas**. 2018 215 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, da Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus, AM, 2018. Accessed on: 24 Feb. 2021.

ALVES, D. O. Os desafios para a política e a pesquisa em educação especial no Brasil. *In*: MENDES, E. G.; ALMEIDA, M. A.; HARYASKI, M. C.P.I. (org.). **Temas em educação especial: conhecimentos para fundamentar a prática**. Araraquara, SP: Junqueira&Marin, 2008. 471p.

ARCARO, R.; GONÇALVES, T. M. Identidade de lugar: um estudo sobre um grupo de moradores atingidos por barragens no município de Timbé do Sul, Santa Catarina. **RAÍGA**, v. 25, p. 38-63, 2012.

ARROYO, M. G.; FERNANDES, B. M. A educação básica e o movimento social do campo. Brasília, DF: Articulação Nacional Por Uma Educação Básica do Campo, 1999. (Coleção por Uma Educação Básica do Campo, n. 2). Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/secad/arquivos/pdf/educacaodocampo/edbasicapopular.pdf>. Accessed on: 12 July. 2021.

BRAZIL. **Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e da Educação-LDB. Brasília, DF, 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm. Accessed on: 12 July. 2021.

BRAZIL. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. **Parâmetros curriculares nacionais: Adaptações Curriculares / Secretaria de Educação Fundamental**. Secretaria de Educação Especial. Brasília: MEC /SEF/SEESP, 1998.

BRAZIL. **Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva**. Brasília: MEC, 2008. Accessed on: 30 Mar. 2021.

BRAZIL. **Resolução CNE/CEB n. 4, de 2 de outubro de 2009**. Institui diretrizes operacionais para o atendimento educacional especializado na Educação Básica, modalidade Educação Especial. Brasília: MEC, 2009. Available at http://portal.mec.gov.br/dmdocuments/rceb004_09.pdf. Accessed on: 20 Jan. 2022.

BRAZIL. **Decreto n. 7.352 de 04 de novembro de 2010**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2010. Available at <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/marco-2012-pdf/10199-8-decreto-7352-de4-denovembro-de-2010/file>. Accessed on: 20 Apr. 2021.

CANDAU, V. M. Direitos humanos, educação e interculturalidade: as tensões entre igualdade e diferença. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 13 n. 37 jan./abr. 2008. DOI: 10.1590/S1413-24782008000100005

FERNANDES, A. P. C. S. **Educação especial nas ilhas**. 1. ed. Curitiba: Appris, 2018.

FERNANDES, A. P. C. S. Crianças ribeirinhas com deficiência: Dilemas éticos, metodológicos e epistemológicos. **Revista Humanidades e Inovação**, v. 7, n. 28. 2020. Available at: <https://www.google.com/search?q=FERNANDES%2C+Ana+Paula+Cunha+dos+Santos%3B>. Accessed on: 21 July. 2021.

FERNANDES, A. P. C. S.; FERNANDES, A. S. Criança ribeirinha com deficiência: acesso e acessibilidade na escola. *In*: FERNANDES, A. P. C. S. **Educação Especial do Campo: trilhas, perspectivas e renovação**. 1. ed. Belém: EdUEPA, 2020.

FERNANDES, A. P. C. S.; SANTOS, A. C. S. Unidade pedagógica na ilha do Combu: o diálogo entre educação especial e educação do campo. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Básica**, ano 6, n. esp., mar. 2021. Available at: <http://rbeducacaobasica.com.br/unidade-pedagogica-na-ilha-do-combu/>. Accessed on: 15 July. 2021.

FERNANDES, A. P. C. S.; OLIVEIRA, I.S. Escolas da Ilha de Mosqueiro e a relação com a Educação Especial. **Revista Brasileira de Educação do Campo**, v. 5, e8650, 2020. DOI: 10.20873/uft.rbec.e8650

FLICK, U. Qualidade na Pesquisa Qualitativa. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009. **Fórum Nacional de Educação do Campo**, 2009. Available at: https://educanp.weebly.com/uploads/1/3/9/9/13997768/fonec_-_notasanlisemomentoatualeducampo_set.pdf. Accessed on 15 Aug. 2021.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 17. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

FREIRE, P.; SHOR, I. **Medo e ousadia: O cotidiano do professor**. 10. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1986.

FROTA, J. A. Concepções de ludicidade na educação infantil enunciados em periódicos no período de 2015-2019. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação**. São Paulo, v. 7, n. 8, ago. 2021.

JERÔNIMO, R. N.T.; GONÇALVES, T. M. O processo de apropriação do espaço e produção da subjetividade. **Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa**, 24, p. 195-200, 2008. DOI: 10.1590/S0102-37722008000200009

LEITE, A. F. O mundo e a criança. *In*: BRANDÃO, A. P.; EITLER, K.; SILVA, P. P. **Maleta Infância: caderno de atividades**. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Futura: Fundação Roberto Marinho, 2013.

LIMA, K. S. C.; LINHARES, F. L. História e Memória das Unidades Especializadas: o caso da UEES Professor Astério de Campos. *In*: FERNANDES, A. P. C. S. **Educação Especial: cidadania, memória e história**. Belém: EDUEPA, 2017. p. 80-111.

LOZANO, D. **A interface entre educação especial e educação do campo em uma escola municipal do interior paulista: um estudo de caso**. 2019. 308 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2019. Available at: <https://teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/48/48134/tde-23052019-180118/pt-br.php>. Accessed on: 21 July. 2020.

MARTINS, R. J.; GONÇALVES, T. M. Apropriação do espaço na pré-escola segundo a Psicologia Ambiental. **Psicologia & Sociedade**, v. 26, n. 3, p. 622-631, 2014. DOI: 10.1590/S0102-71822014000300011

MINAYO, M. C. S. (org.). **Pesquisa social: teoria método e criatividade**. 17. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1994.

MIRANDA, V. R. **As práticas curriculares vivenciadas pelos jovens com deficiência no Ensino Médio**. 2021. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) –Universidade do Estado do Pará, Belém, 2021.

MORANTA, T. V.; URRÚTIA, E. P. La apropiación del espacio: una propuesta teórica para comprender la vinculación entre las personas y los lugares. **Anuario de Psicología**, v. 36, n. 3, p. 281-297, 2005.

NERES, C. C. **As instituições especializadas e o movimento da inclusão escolar: intenções e práticas**. 2010. 158 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2010. Available at: http://www.educadores.diaadia.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/2010/artigos_teses/2011/pedagogia/tinclusaoescolar.pdf. Accessed on: 10 Feb. 2021.

NICOLESCU, B. **O manifesto da transdisciplinaridade**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Triom, 2005.

OLIVEIRA, I. A.; MOTA-NETO, J. C. A construção de categorias de análise na pesquisa em educação. *In*: MARCONDES, M. I.; OLIVEIRA, I. A.; TEIXEIRA E. (org.). **Abordagens teóricas e construções metodológicas na pesquisa em educação**. Eduepa, 2011.

How to reference this article

SANTOS, A. C. S.; FERNANDES, A. P. C. S. The specialized educational unit considering special education and countryside education. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 26, n. 00, e022015, Jan./Dec. 2022. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v26i00.16465>

Submitted: 07/11/2021

Revisions required: 21/12/2021

Approved: 20/02/2022

Published: 31/03/2022

Management of translations and versions: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação