



¹ Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP), Caçador – SC – Brazil. Graduate; Graduate Program in Basic Education.

² Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP), Caçador – SC – Brazil. Faculty member in the Graduate Program in Basic Education.

³ Regional University of Blumenau (FURB), Caçador – SC – Brazil. Faculty member in the Graduate Program in Natural Sciences and Mathematics Education.

⁴ Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP), Caçador – SC – Brazil. Faculty member in the Graduate Program in Basic Education.

⁵ Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP), Caçador – SC – Brazil. Faculty member in the Graduate Program in Basic Education.



ACCESSIBILITY IN MULTIFUNCTIONAL RESOURCE ROOMS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

ACESSIBILIDADE NAS SALAS DE RECURSOS MULTIFUNCIONAIS COMO INSTRUMENTO DE GESTÃO EDUCACIONAL

LA ACCESIBILIDAD EN LAS SALAS DE RECURSOS MULTIFUNCIONALES COMO INSTRUMENTO DE GESTIÓN EDUCATIVA

Lislaine Paula Queiróz FERREIRA¹

lisppqf@yahoo.com.br



Madalena Pereira da SILVA²

madalenapereiradasilva@gmail.com



Vera Lucia SIMÃO³

vsimao@furb.br



Simone Caroline PIONTKEWICZ⁴

simone.caroline@uniarp.edu.br



Adelcio Machado dos SANTOS⁵

adelciomachado@gmail.com



How to reference this article:

Ferreira, L. P. Q., Silva, M. P., Simão, V. L., Piontkewicz, S. C., & Santos, A. M. (2025). Accessibility in multifunctional resource rooms as an instrument of educational management. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 29, e025119. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v29i00.21037>

Submitted: 15/06/2025

Revisions required: 08/08/2025

Approved: 20/10/2025

Published: 28/12/2025

ABSTRACT: This study analyzes accessibility in Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs), based on the results of research conducted within the field of Special Education, focusing on the implications for educational management. Grounded in public policies for inclusive education, the study adopts a qualitative approach, using a questionnaire, a form organized according to accessibility dimensions, and direct observation, followed by content analysis. The results reveal weaknesses and potentialities in the architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic dimensions, highlighting tensions between normative frameworks and their implementation in the school context. By understanding accessibility as an analytical dimension of public policy, the study contributes to expanding the understanding of MRRs as instruments of educational management, providing support for planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes. It concludes that diagnosing accessibility dimensions strengthens the articulation between public policies, school practices, and educational management.

KEYWORDS: Accessibility. Inclusive Education. Multifunctional Resource Rooms. Public Policies. Educational Management.

RESUMO: Este estudo analisa a acessibilidade nas Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais (SRMs), a partir dos resultados de uma pesquisa realizada no campo da Educação Especial, com foco nas implicações para a gestão educacional. Ancorado nas políticas públicas de educação inclusiva, o estudo adota abordagem qualitativa, utilizando um questionário, um formulário organizado por dimensões da acessibilidade e observação direta, com posterior análise de conteúdo. Os resultados evidenciam fragilidades e potencialidades nas dimensões arquitetônica, atitudinal, comunicacional, instrumental, metodológica e programática, revelando tensões entre os marcos normativos e sua efetivação no contexto escolar. Ao compreender a acessibilidade como dimensão analítica da política pública, o estudo contribui para preencher uma lacuna empírica relacionada à compreensão das SRMs como instrumento de gestão educacional, oferecendo subsídios aos processos de planejamento, monitoramento e avaliação das políticas inclusivas. Conclui-se que o diagnóstico das dimensões da acessibilidade fortalece a articulação entre políticas públicas, práticas escolares e gestão educacional.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Acessibilidade. Educação Inclusiva. Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais. Políticas Públicas. Gestão Educacional.

RESUMEN: Este estudio analiza la accesibilidad en las Salas de Recursos Multifuncionales (SRM), a partir de los resultados de una investigación desarrollada en el ámbito de la Educación Especial, con foco en sus implicaciones para la gestión educativa. Fundamentado en las políticas públicas de educación inclusiva, el estudio adopta un enfoque cualitativo, utilizando un cuestionario, un formulario organizado según las dimensiones de la accesibilidad y observación directa, con posterior análisis de contenido. Los resultados evidencian fragilidades y potencialidades en las dimensiones arquitectónica, actitudinal, comunicacional, instrumental, metodológica y programática, revelando tensiones entre los marcos normativos y su implementación en el contexto escolar. Al comprender la accesibilidad como una dimensión analítica de la política pública, el estudio contribuye a ampliar la comprensión de las SRM como instrumento de gestión educativa, ofreciendo aportes para los procesos de planificación, monitoreo y evaluación de las políticas inclusivas. Se concluye que el diagnóstico de las dimensiones de la accesibilidad fortalece la articulación entre políticas públicas, prácticas escolares y gestión educativa.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Accesibilidad. Educación Inclusiva. Salas de Recursos Multifuncionales. Políticas Públicas. Gestión Educativa.

Article submitted to the similarity system



Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz.

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE),
Araraquara, v. 29, n. 00, e025119, 2025.

e-ISSN: 1519-9029



10.22633/rpge.v29i00.21037

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has consolidated, in recent decades, as a guiding principle of public educational policies in Brazil, particularly following the recognition of education as a fundamental social right and the valorization of human diversity within school environments. In this context, Special Education, from the perspective of inclusive education, has come to be understood as a cross-cutting modality aimed at ensuring access, permanence, participation, and learning for students with disabilities in mainstream education, in alignment with current legal and regulatory frameworks, notably the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) (Brazil, 1996) and the Brazilian Law of Inclusion (LBI) (Brazil, 2015).

Among the central elements for the implementation of these policies, accessibility stands out, understood not merely as the physical adaptation of spaces, but as a structuring principle of educational practices and institutional actions. As noted by Sasaki (2009), accessibility must be analyzed in a multidimensional manner, encompassing architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic aspects, which are inter-related and condition the effective inclusion of students with disabilities across different social and educational contexts.

Within the scope of Basic Education, Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs) are configured as one of the main strategies of Special Education public policy, as they enable the provision of Specialized Educational Assistance (SEA) in the opposite shift, with the purpose of complementing and supplementing the schooling of students who are the target audience of Special Education. However, the formal existence of MRRs alone does not guarantee the implementation of the principles of inclusive education, especially when barriers persist that limit access, participation, and the full development of students with disabilities.

Although Brazilian legislation ensures the right to education in accessible and inclusive environments, it is observed that the materialization of these regulations within educational systems still occurs unevenly and, in many cases, remains fragile. Public policies on special education, when analyzed in their concrete implementation, reveal tensions between what is prescribed in official documents and what is effectively carried out in the daily life of school institutions, particularly with regard to the structural, pedagogical, and human conditions of MRRs.

In this sense, analyzing accessibility in MRRs constitutes a productive pathway for understanding the limits and potentialities of special education public policies at the local level. By highlighting how the different dimensions of accessibility manifest within the school environment, it becomes possible to identify not only physical or pedagogical barriers, but also institutional and political weaknesses that directly impact the organization of pedagogical work and educational management processes.

In light of this scenario, the present study analyzes accessibility in MRRs based on the results of research conducted within the field of Special Education, focusing on the implications of this process for educational management.

To this end, the analysis is grounded in the dimensions of accessibility—architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic—according to the framework proposed by Sasaki (2009), understanding accessibility as an analytical dimension of public policy. Accordingly, the study is guided by the following research question: to what extent have special education public policies, with regard to accessibility, been implemented in Multifunctional Resource Rooms, and what implications does this process have for educational management?

By articulating public policy, accessibility, and inclusive education, this study aims to contribute to the debate in the field of educational policy and management, demonstrating that the effective implementation of school inclusion depends not only on consistent regulatory frameworks, but also on continuous processes of monitoring, planning, and decision-making, guided by diagnoses that reveal the actual operating conditions of MRRs.

PUBLIC POLICIES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND ACCESSIBILITY

Special Education, from the perspective of inclusive education, has been consolidated in Brazil as the result of a historical process marked by normative advances, conceptual disputes, and tensions between formulated policies and practices effectively implemented within education systems. Following the enactment of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) (Brazil, 1996), Special Education came to be recognized as a cross-cutting modality, to be preferably offered within mainstream education, ensuring the right to schooling for students with disabilities in common environments, with the necessary support.

This legal framework was expanded by subsequent regulations, particularly the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (Brazil, 2008), which reaffirms the schooling of students who are the target audience of Special Education in mainstream education and defines Specialized Educational Assistance (SEA) as a complementary or supplementary service to schooling. In this context, school inclusion is no longer understood as an assistive or compensatory action, but rather as a responsibility of the educational system, requiring structural, pedagogical, and institutional reorganization.

The analysis of public policies in special education, however, requires recognizing that normative texts are not “applied” linearly within local contexts. Reflecting on a decade of the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEEPEI),

Silva et al. (2018) demonstrate that policy texts are interpreted, contested, and may be “re-created” in the context of practice, carrying marks of challenges, advances, and setbacks.

This understanding reinforces the need for analyses that articulate normative frameworks with concrete conditions of implementation, especially within municipal public education systems, where policy is materialized through administrative decisions, investments, training, and the organization of pedagogical work.

The Brazilian Law of Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (LBI) (Brazil, 2015) reinforces this perspective by establishing accessibility as a fundamental right and an indispensable condition for the exercise of citizenship. By determining that the State must ensure inclusive educational systems at all levels and modalities, the legislation shifts the debate on inclusion from the realm of intention to that of legal obligation, highlighting the need for public policies that guarantee real conditions for access, permanence, participation, and learning.

In this direction, Correia and Baptista (2018) argue that the PNEEPEI (Brazil, 2008) aligns with the principles of the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, whose conception of disability is understood as resulting from the interaction between the individual and the context.

It is precisely this emphasis on the subject–context relationship that brings accessibility to the forefront as a political-conceptual foundation for expanding the right to education beyond initial processes of belonging.

Thus, accessibility cannot be reduced to physical adaptation; it expresses an institutional commitment to the removal of barriers of different natures, a necessary condition for the effective materialization of inclusive policy.

Within Basic Education, MRRs are configured as one of the main strategies of Special Education public policy, as they enable the provision of SEA in the opposite shift, with the purpose of complementing and supplementing the schooling of students who are the target audience of Special Education. However, the formal existence of MRRs alone does not guarantee the implementation of the principles of inclusive education, especially when barriers persist that limit access, participation, and the full development of students with disabilities.

Recent studies have shown that, although Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs) constitute an important mechanism within Special Education public policy, their implementation in everyday school settings involves challenges related to institutional conditions, teacher training, and the articulation between Specialized Educational Assistance (SEA) and the mainstream classroom. When analyzing pedagogical practices in MRRs within Basic Education, Furlaneto (2025) highlights that SEA teachers play a central role in mediating inclusive processes, although they face limitations associated with infrastructure, increasing student demand, and integration among school professionals. Similarly, Silva et al. (2025) emphasize that the effectiveness of SEA depends on structural, pedagogical, and organizational conditions that

foster the removal of barriers to learning and participation for students who are the target audience of Special Education, revealing persistent challenges related to teacher training, school infrastructure, and coordination among professionals involved in SEA.

Other studies indicate that the municipal implementation of the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEEPEI) tends to reveal both advances and recurring challenges in dimensions directly related to the daily functioning of MRRs. Ribas et al. (2019), in analyzing studies on policy implementation in Brazilian municipalities, identify categories and subcategories that include SEA/MRRs, physical/architectural accessibility, inclusive pedagogical practices, teacher training, and institutional support. This systematization demonstrates that the success of inclusive policy depends on structural and organizational conditions, as well as on coordination among management, schools, and teachers, forming a framework that goes beyond the mere existence of the service.

In this context, the concept of accessibility assumes a central role in the analysis of Special Education public policies. According to Sasaki (2009), accessibility should be understood as a set of conditions that enable any individual to use spaces, services, information, and communication safely and autonomously, regardless of their physical, sensory, intellectual, or social characteristics. The author proposes analyzing accessibility through six interdependent dimensions: architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic.

The architectural dimension refers to the elimination of physical barriers in school environments, ensuring circulation and mobility for students with disabilities. The attitudinal dimension concerns the attitudes, values, and behaviors of individuals within the school community and is considered fundamental for overcoming prejudice and exclusionary practices. Communicational accessibility involves ensuring multiple forms of communication, including human and technological resources that guarantee access to information and social interaction.

The instrumental and methodological dimensions relate, respectively, to the availability of resources, materials, and assistive technologies, and to the pedagogical strategies adopted in the teaching and learning process. Finally, the programmatic dimension refers to institutional policies, regulations, and guidelines that shape the organization of the educational system, highlighting that accessibility is also constructed at the level of political and administrative decision-making (Sasaki, 2009).

These dimensions are directly aligned with technical standards and guidelines applicable to the educational context, such as the Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR 9050 (Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas [ABNT], 2020), which establishes criteria and parameters for accessibility in buildings, furniture, and equipment, and the Manual of Spatial Accessibility for

Schools: the right to an accessible school (Dischinger et al., 2009), which reinforces accessibility as both a pedagogical and institutional principle.

When addressing accessibility within the scope of educational policy and management, it is important to distinguish between accessibility and inclusion as related, yet non-equivalent, concepts. Santos and Melo (2019) point out that accessibility tends to be linked to specific needs (such as those of persons with disabilities), whereas inclusion constitutes a broader human rights principle directed at all individuals, implying the need to “think of everyone and act for each individual” in a non-standardized manner. The authors further argue that the success of accessibility and inclusion initiatives is closely tied to the commitment and coherence demonstrated by institutional management. This formulation provides a theoretical basis for understanding accessibility as a strategic axis for planning and monitoring inclusive policies within everyday school practices.

Thus, understanding Special Education public policies through the lens of accessibility in MRRs allows the discussion of inclusion to move beyond a purely normative discourse toward a concrete analysis of the institutional conditions that sustain—or weaken—the realization of the right to inclusive education. This perspective contributes to the field of educational policy and management by demonstrating that school inclusion requires coordinated actions, supported by diagnostic processes that guide decision-making and promote effective transformations within educational systems.

METHODOLOGY

This study is characterized as qualitative in approach, with a bibliographic and field-based design, as it sought to understand in depth how the principles of accessibility are materialized in MRRs within the context of Basic Education, in light of Special Education public policies. The choice of a qualitative approach is justified by its capacity to analyze educational phenomena in their complexity, considering the meanings attributed by participants and the institutional conditions in which practices are developed (Minayo, 2001).

Regarding the methodological design, the research was conducted in two municipal Basic Education schools in the municipality of União da Vitória, in the state of Paraná, identified as School A and School B, both of which have operational Multifunctional Resource Rooms. The selection of these institutions was intentional, based on the existence of SEA and the availability of teachers working in the MRRs during the period of data collection. This delimitation enabled a more in-depth analysis of accessibility conditions and the functioning of SEA within the investigated context, allowing for a more detailed understanding of practices and institutional conditions related to the implementation of Special Education policy at the local level.

It is acknowledged, however, that the analysis conducted in a limited number of schools does not allow for generalizations to other educational systems or contexts. Therefore, the results should be understood as situated evidence, contributing to the understanding of the conditions under which Special Education public policy is implemented in a specific municipal context, and providing analytical support for reflections in the field of educational management and inclusive education.

The study participants were teachers working in the MRRs of the selected schools, who responded to a questionnaire designed to gather their perceptions regarding accessibility conditions within the institutions. Additionally, a structured form was used to collect data on the six dimensions of accessibility—architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic—based on the framework proposed by Sassaki (2009).

The data collection instruments were developed based on normative and technical references regulating accessibility in the educational context, particularly the Brazilian Standard ABNT NBR 9050 (ABNT, 2020) and the Manual of Spatial Accessibility for Schools: the right to an accessible school (Dischinger et al., 2009). These documents guided the development of the analytical criteria, enabling the identification of barriers and potentialities related to accessibility in MRRs.

Data collection was carried out through the administration of the questionnaire to MRR teachers (Table 1), while the structured form was applied through direct observation of school spaces and verification of information with the teachers responsible for the MRRs (Table 2). The records encompassed physical, pedagogical, communicational, and institutional aspects, allowing for an integrated view of the operating conditions of the MRRs.

Table 1
Questionnaire for Assessing Accessibility Administered to Teachers

DIMENSIONS OF ACCESSIBILITY
1 – How would you describe the architectural accessibility (physical structure) of the Multifunctional Resource Room (MRR) in your school?
2 – What procedures does the school implement regarding communicational accessibility in activities for students with disabilities?
3 – How are activities for students with disabilities carried out in relation to attitudinal accessibility?
4 – Does your school have a pedagogical-political project or any other document addressing programmatic accessibility that includes the need for a Multifunctional Resource Room?
5 – According to methodological accessibility, which learning methods are applied? Do you produce and/or use appropriate teaching materials to meet the needs of students with disabilities?
6 – How does your school use study tools in terms of instrumental accessibility? Is there any type of adaptation of teaching materials? Regarding the use of technologies, are devices, tools, or other assistive technology resources employed?
7 – How many students attend the MRR, and what types of disabilities do they have?

8 – What strategies does your school use with students who have disabilities?

Note. Adapted from Vasconcelos and Sonza (2017).

Table 2

Data Collection Form for Assessing Accessibility in MRRs

ARCHITECTURAL DIMENSION	
Corridor width	Note the measurements and whether they comply with the current standard.
Circulation area width	
Entrance ramp	Yes or no; do they comply with the current standard?
Ramps to classrooms	
Ramp to the restroom	
Ramp to the library	
Adapted restrooms	
Grab bars	
Non-slip flooring	
Tactile flooring	
Level differences	
ATTITUDINAL DIMENSION	
Teachers' reception	Observe on site and take notes
Students' reception	
Relationship with teachers	
Relationship with other students	
School-family relationship	
COMMUNICATIONAL DIMENSION	
Use of Brazilian Sign Language (Libras) in the classroom context	Observe on site, ask the SRM teachers questions, and take notes.
Use of Braille in the classroom context	
Study groups on disabilities	
Study groups on diversity	
Staff awareness	
School community awareness	
Use of signage and universal design	

INSTRUMENTAL DIMENSION	
Adequacy of pedagogical materials	Observe on site, ask the SRM teachers, and take notes.
Adequacy of school furniture	
Inclusive games	
Computers for student use	
Laptops for classroom use	
Projector	
Sound equipment	
TVs and DVDs	
METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION	
Professionals with specialized training	Observe on site, ask the SRM teachers, and take notes.
Adaptation of the school environment	
Adaptation of teaching methods	
Adaptation of teaching modalities	
Specialized Educational Assistance	
Co-teaching = partnership between the mainstream classroom teacher and the SEA teacher	
Interns	
Learning laboratory	
Various projects	

Note. Adapted from Fávero and Costa (2014).

For data analysis, the content analysis technique proposed by Bardin (2016) was adopted as a reference, structured in the stages of pre-analysis, material exploration, and treatment and interpretation of results. Data categorization was guided by a thematic analysis process, in which responses obtained from the research instruments were organized and interpreted in light of the accessibility dimensions proposed by Sassaki (2009). These dimensions constituted a priori analytical categories, allowing for the systematization of empirical evidence according to the different types of barriers and accessibility conditions identified in the Multifunctional Resource Rooms. Based on this procedure, the data were grouped into thematic units corresponding to the analytical dimensions, enabling the interpretation of how each dimension manifests within the investigated context.

Regarding ethical procedures, the study was submitted to and approved by a Research Ethics Committee (approval no. 5,497,756), in accordance with the ethical principles governing research involving human participants. All participants signed an Informed Consent Form, ensuring the confidentiality of information, the anonymity of participants, and the exclusive use

of data for academic and scientific purposes, in compliance with current regulations (Brazil, 2012).

The adopted methodology enabled not only the identification of accessibility conditions in MRRs but also the construction of a diagnostic framework that serves as a relevant analytical tool for understanding Special Education public policies in practice, highlighting their implications for the organization of pedagogical work and for educational management processes.

It is important to note that the empirical data analyzed in this article are part of a broader study developed within the Graduate Program in Basic Education, whose investigative trajectory was systematized in a master's thesis (Ferreira, 2023). Part of the results concerning the diagnosis of accessibility conditions in MRRs was previously published in another scientific article (Ferreira & Silva, 2024). Unlike that study, which focused on the descriptive analysis of empirical data and on the contribution of applied research to Basic Education, the present article proposes an analytical shift by deepening the discussion of the implications of these findings for educational management and for the effectiveness of Special Education public policies. It therefore constitutes a distinct analytical approach, guided by specific objectives and oriented toward the interface between public policy, accessibility, and educational management.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Data analysis revealed that the implementation of Special Education public policies, with regard to accessibility in MRRs, occurs in an uneven, fragmented, and, in many respects, weakened manner. Although the schools investigated are part of the same municipal education system and subject to the same legal regulations, significant differences were observed in the materialization of accessibility dimensions, revealing recurring tensions between the formal policy framework and its implementation in the context of school practice.

This finding aligns with the historical analysis presented by Jannuzzi (2012), which shows that Special Education in Brazil has been marked by discontinuities, isolated actions, and difficulties in the institutionalization of public policies. Although legal frameworks have advanced in recognizing rights, the effective implementation of school inclusion depends on structural, administrative, and political conditions that are not always consolidated within education systems. This interpretation is consistent with the findings of Silva et al. (2018), who indicate that the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education is continuously reinterpreted in practice, producing uneven outcomes across systems and institutions.

With regard to the architectural dimension, the results indicated the persistence of physical barriers that compromise the autonomy and mobility of students with disabilities, such as the absence of adequate ramps, insufficient adapted restrooms, and inadequate accessible signage.

Among the situations reported by teachers, difficulties related to the absence or inadequacy of ramps and the limited availability of adapted spaces within school institutions were particularly highlighted. As one participant noted, “the school has some adaptations, but we still encounter difficulties in ensuring full access for all students to different environments.”

These limitations demonstrate a gap between the parameters established by ABNT NBR 9050 (ABNT, 2020) and the actual conditions observed in school institutions, also highlighting the need for management decisions related to planning and prioritizing investments in accessibility. Although legislation guarantees the right to accessible environments, its implementation depends on political and administrative decisions within educational management, particularly regarding planning and investment prioritization—an aspect also identified in studies on the municipal implementation of inclusive policy (Ribas et al., 2019).

The attitudinal dimension emerged as one of the most sensitive elements for the effective implementation of inclusive education. Teachers emphasized the importance of collective commitment within the school community to the inclusion of students with disabilities. One teacher stated that “the work of inclusion depends greatly on collaboration among teachers, the school, and the family,” highlighting that school inclusion involves not only structural conditions but also attitudes and institutional relationships. Data analysis indicated the need to expand continuing education processes and awareness initiatives within the school community. As noted by Mazzotta (1996), inclusion is not achieved merely by the presence of students with disabilities in mainstream schools; it requires transformations in pedagogical conceptions, social relationships, and institutional culture. When such changes are not assumed as collective and institutional responsibilities, inclusion tends to rely on individual teacher initiatives, thereby weakening the continuity of inclusive practices.

With regard to the communicational dimension, the analysis revealed weaknesses related to the provision of resources and services that ensure accessible communication for students with disabilities, such as the presence of specialized professionals and access to appropriate materials. These limitations compromise students’ full participation in the educational process and reinforce the understanding that school inclusion requires public policies articulated across education, accessibility, and human rights, as established by the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (Brazil, 2008).

The instrumental dimension showed that, although some of the equipment and pedagogical materials intended for MRRs are available, their quantity, diversity, and level of updating remain insufficient. As reported by one of the participating teachers, “there are some

resources in the resource room, but we often need to adapt materials or seek other strategies to meet students' needs." In their statements, teachers indicated that the pedagogical use of these resources does not always occur systematically, demonstrating that the mere provision of materials does not, in itself, ensure the implementation of inclusion. This finding aligns with the analysis of Ribas et al. (2019), who identify that the implementation of Special Education policy in Brazilian municipalities faces recurring challenges related to the articulation among resources, teacher training, and institutional support, particularly within MRRs.

In the methodological dimension, the data highlight the efforts of teachers to develop differentiated strategies to meet the needs of students attending MRRs, indicating that the institutionalization of inclusive practices depends on training and support policies defined within the scope of educational management. Teachers reported the constant need to adapt pedagogical activities, considering the specificities of each student. As one participant stated, "it is necessary to continuously adapt activities so that students can follow and develop their learning." However, such practices remain strongly dependent on the individual engagement of teachers and lack greater institutionalization within school pedagogical projects and within the guidelines of the education system. This reliance on individual effort reveals historical limitations of Special Education policy in Brazil, as analyzed by Mazzotta (1996) and Jannuzzi (2012), who point to the fragility of inclusive actions when dissociated from consistent management policies.

Finally, the programmatic dimension revealed gaps in the incorporation of accessibility as a structuring axis of planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes in educational policies. Although the public policy is formally established, the results indicate that accessibility still occupies a peripheral position in institutional documents and management practices. As argued by Santos and Melo (2019), the success of accessibility and inclusion initiatives is closely linked to the commitment and coherence demonstrated by institutional management, reinforcing the need to incorporate accessibility as a political and administrative premise.

The results observed across the different dimensions of accessibility—particularly the weaknesses related to structural conditions, teacher training, and the articulation between SEA and mainstream education—reinforce that the effective implementation of school inclusion depends on institutional and management conditions that sustain SEA and MRRs on a continuous basis, beyond isolated initiatives. In line with this, recent studies have emphasized similar challenges in the implementation of Special Education policies from an inclusive perspective (Furlaneto, 2025; Silva et al., 2025).

In this sense, the analysis of accessibility dimensions in MRRs demonstrates that the challenges of school inclusion are not limited to pedagogical practices or school infrastructure, but directly involve planning, monitoring, and decision-making processes within educational management.

Barbosa (2024), in analyzing teachers' perceptions in Multifunctional Resource Rooms, identifies weaknesses related to the institutionalization of inclusive policies, teacher training, and the operational conditions of SEA, converging with the interpretation constructed from the data of this study. Complementarily, Gai (2025) points out that, in the post-pandemic period, the organization of MRRs remains marked by territorial and institutional inequalities, highlighting the central role of educational management in mediating between the normative frameworks of public policies and school practices.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS FOR EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

The findings of this study demonstrate that accessibility in MRRs should be understood as a strategic indicator of the effectiveness of Special Education public policies, rather than merely as a set of technical or structural adjustments. From this perspective, the analysis of accessibility dimensions enables educational management to develop a critical understanding of the institutional conditions that sustain—or weaken—the implementation of inclusive education within the school context.

Figure 1

Accessibility in MRRs as a mediating axis between public policies and educational management



Note. Authors (2026).

Figure 1 presents an analytical-conceptual framework in which accessibility is positioned as a mediating axis between the formulation of Special Education public policies and their implementation within the school context. The diagnosis of accessibility dimensions in MRRs supports processes of planning, training, investment, monitoring, and evaluation within educational management, contributing to the continuous feedback of inclusive policies.

The analysis of accessibility dimensions—architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic (Sasaki, 2009)—makes it possible to identify empirical evidence that reveals both weaknesses and potentialities in the implementation of public policies. These findings, systematized through an institutional diagnosis, provide relevant input for planning, decision-making, and evaluation processes within educational management.

The identified architectural barriers, for example, indicate that physical accessibility has not yet assumed a central role in planning processes and in the prioritization of investments, despite its legal provision. This finding reinforces that educational management

plays a decisive role in translating normative guidelines into continuous structural actions. Similarly, the weaknesses observed in the attitudinal and methodological dimensions demonstrate that school inclusion remains, to a large extent, dependent on individual teacher initiatives, revealing limitations in the institutionalization of inclusive policies—an aspect already highlighted by Mazzotta (1996) when discussing the historical fragility of Special Education in the absence of consistent management policies.

In the same vein, with regard to the communicational and instrumental dimensions, the results indicate challenges related to the articulation among public policies, available resources, and pedagogical practices. The insufficient availability of specialized professionals, assistive technologies, and accessible materials demonstrates that the provision of resources alone does not ensure the implementation of inclusion, requiring integrated actions in training, monitoring, and institutional support. This scenario aligns with Jannuzzi (2012), who emphasizes that the discontinuity of actions and the fragmentation of policies undermine the consolidation of inclusive education as a state policy.

The programmatic dimension, in turn, highlights the need to incorporate accessibility as a structuring axis within institutional documents and in the monitoring processes of educational policies. As illustrated in Figure 1, the absence of systematic accessibility indicators in the planning processes of education systems limits the capacity of educational management to assess the effectiveness of inclusive actions and to promote the necessary adjustments over time.

Thus, by articulating public policies, accessibility, and empirical evidence, this study demonstrates that the diagnosis of accessibility dimensions in MRRs constitutes a powerful analytical tool for educational management. Beyond identifying problems, this diagnostic approach supports planning processes, continuing professional development, prioritization of investments, and the evaluation of Special Education public policies, contributing to the continuous improvement of inclusive policies.

Accordingly, accessibility, understood in its multidimensional nature, assumes a central role in the effective implementation of inclusive education, demonstrating that ensuring the right to education for students with disabilities requires educational management committed to robust diagnostics, evidence-based decision-making, and institutional actions aligned with public policies.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study analyzed accessibility in Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs) in light of Special Education public policies, demonstrating how the materialization of these policies

within the school context occurs in an uneven and, in many respects, fragile manner. By considering the dimensions of accessibility—architectural, attitudinal, communicational, instrumental, methodological, and programmatic—it was possible to understand that the effective implementation of inclusive education goes beyond the formal compliance with legal frameworks, requiring coordinated institutional actions supported by continuous processes of planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

The findings indicate that, although the Brazilian normative framework ensures the right to inclusive education (Brazil, 1996; Brazil, 2008; Brazil, 2015), barriers persist that compromise the access, participation, and learning of students with disabilities in the schools analyzed. These barriers reveal historical tensions between the formulation of public policies and their concrete implementation, reinforcing the understanding that school inclusion constitutes a social, political, and institutional process, rather than merely a technical or pedagogical issue (Mazzotta, 1996; Jannuzzi, 2012).

In this context, the study demonstrates that accessibility in MRRs serves as a relevant indicator of the effectiveness of Special Education public policies, as synthesized in Figure 1. The diagnosis of accessibility dimensions proved to be a powerful analytical tool, capable of revealing both weaknesses and potentialities of inclusive policy at the local level, thereby supporting reflections in the field of educational policy and management. By making explicit the actual operating conditions of MRRs, this diagnostic approach contributes to shifting the debate on inclusion from a normative perspective to a concrete analysis of the institutional conditions that sustain the schooling of students with disabilities.

The implications of the findings for educational management reinforce the need to incorporate accessibility as a structuring axis of educational planning, continuing professional development, investment prioritization, and the monitoring of public policies. The absence of systematic accessibility indicators in management processes limits the capacity of education systems to assess the effectiveness of inclusive actions and to implement necessary adjustments, thereby hindering the consolidation of inclusive education as a state policy.

As a limitation of the study, it is important to highlight the empirical scope restricted to a specific municipal context, which does not allow for broad generalizations. However, this delimitation does not diminish the relevance of the findings, as the identified weaknesses are consistent with challenges historically documented in the literature on Special Education and inclusion in Brazil. On the contrary, the study provides a basis for further reflections and future research in other educational contexts, expanding the debate on accessibility, public policies, and educational management.

In conclusion, the effective implementation of inclusive education requires more than consistent legal frameworks; it demands educational management committed to systematic diagnostics, evidence-based decision-making, and institutional actions aligned with public policies. By conceptualizing accessibility as a mediation between policy and practice, this study contributes to the field of educational policy and management by demonstrating that the diagnosis of accessibility dimensions can serve as an analytical instrument to guide planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes of inclusive policies.

REFERENCES

- Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas. (2020). *NBR 9050: Acessibilidade a edificações, mobiliário, espaços e equipamentos urbanos*. ABNT.
- Barbosa, A. F. S. (2024). *Atendimento educacional especializado (AEE) e equidade em educação: Percepções de professoras de salas de recursos multifuncionais de Patos de Minas (MG)* [Dissertação de mestrado profissional, Universidade de Uberaba]. Repositório Uniube.
- Bardin, L. (2016). *Análise de conteúdo* (E. Reto & L. A. Pinheiro, Trads.; 3ª ed.). Edições 70.
- Brasil. (1996). *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Presidência da República. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm
- Brasil. (2008). *Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*. Ministério da Educação. <http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/politicaeducespecial.pdf>
- Brasil. (2012). *Resolução nº 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012*. Diretrizes e normas regulamentadoras de pesquisas envolvendo seres humanos. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. <https://conselho.saude.gov.br/resolucoes/2012/Reso466.pdf>
- Brasil. (2015). *Lei nº 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015*. Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). Presidência da República. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm
- Correia, G. M., & Baptista, C. R. (2018). A Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva (2008): Origens, fundamentos e trajetórias. *Revista Online de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 22(n. esp. 2), 38–55. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.unesp.v22.nesp2.dez.2018.11905>
- Dischinger, M., Ely, V. H. M. B., & Borges, M. M. (2009). *Manual de acessibilidade espacial para escolas: O direito à escola acessível*. MEC/UFSC.
- Fávero, H. C., & Costa, H. G. (2014). Inclusão: A acessibilidade como garantia de educação de qualidade. In *Anais do 11º Simpósio de Excelência em Gestão e Tecnologia*. <https://www.aedb.br/seget/arquivos/artigos14/44520505.pdf>
- Ferreira, L. P. Q. (2023). *Educação inclusiva e os princípios da acessibilidade nas salas de recursos multifuncionais* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe]. <https://acervo.uniarp.edu.br/?dissertacao=educacao-inclusiva-e-os-principios-da-acessibilidade-nas-salas-de-recursos-multifuncionais>
- Ferreira, L. P. Q., & Silva, M. P. da. (2024). A contribuição da pesquisa na pós-graduação para a educação inclusiva: Um diagnóstico das salas de recursos multifuncionais na educação

- básica de União da Vitória, PR. *Debates em Educação*, 16(38), e18424. <https://doi.org/10.28998/2175-6600.2024v16n38pe18424>
- Furlaneto, P. R. da S. (2025). *Sala de recursos multifuncionais: Desafios e possibilidades das práticas pedagógicas* [Tese de doutorado, Universidade Católica de Santos]. <https://tede.unisantos.br/handle/tede/8085>
- Gai, D. N. (2025). Atendimento educacional especializado: Narrativas acerca das salas de recursos multifuncionais de diferentes redes de ensino de Porto Alegre/RS. In J. S. D. A. Fontoura & J. M. Silva (Orgs.), *A qualidade social da educação: Diálogos, contextos e perspectivas* (pp. 107–120). Pragmatha.
- Jannuzzi, G. S. M. (2012). *A educação do deficiente no Brasil: Dos primórdios ao início do século XXI* (3ª ed.). Autores Associados.
- Mazzotta, M. J. S. (1996). *Educação especial no Brasil: História e políticas públicas*. Cortez.
- Minayo, M. C. S. (2001). *O desafio do conhecimento: Pesquisa qualitativa em saúde* (8ª ed.). Hucitec.
- Ribas, J. F., Pires, A. S., & Araújo, M. A. (2019). Estudos sobre a implementação da Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva em municípios brasileiros. *Revista Online de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 23(3), 2746–2765. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v23i3.12806>
- Santos, M. P., & Melo, S. C. (2019). Interseções na gestão da acessibilidade e inclusão no contexto educacional. *Revista Online de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 23(n. esp. 1), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v23nesp1.13008>
- Sasaki, R. K. (2009). Inclusão: Acessibilidade no lazer, trabalho e educação. *Revista Nacional de Reabilitação*, 12(70), 10–16.
- Silva, E. P., Souza, V. L. T., & Faleiro, W. (2018). Uma década da Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva: Do ideal ao possível. *Revista Online de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 22(n. esp. 2), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.unesp.v22.nesp2.dez.2018.11906>
- Silva, J. de A., Barboza, N. A. S., & Coutinho, D. J. G. (2025). Os desafios do atendimento educacional especializado (AEE). *Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação*, 11(3), 690–700. <https://doi.org/10.51891/rease.v11i3.18347>
- Vasconcelos, M. H. S., & Sonza, A. P. (2017). Escola acessível: Um direito de todos. In *Anais do 1º Seminário Luso-Brasileiro de Educação Inclusiva: O ensino e a aprendizagem em discussão* (pp. 932–948). PUCRS. <https://ebooks.pucrs.br/edipucrs/anais/i-seminario-luso-brasileiro-de-educacao-inclusiva/assets/artigos/eixo-8/completo-7.pdf>

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgements: Municipal Department of Education of União da Vitória, Paraná.

Funding: None.

Conflicts of interest: None.

Ethical approval: Yes. This study derives from a master's dissertation, whose research project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP).

Data and material availability: Data and material availability.

Authors' contribution: The first author conducted the research (data collection and analysis); the second author contributed to the organization and writing of the manuscript; the remaining authors performed the critical review of the manuscript.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação

Proofreading, formatting, standardization and translation

