

The pedagogical coordinator in public policies education in Brazil

O coordenador pedagógico nas políticas públicas de educação do Brasil

El coordinador pedagógico en políticas públicas sobre la educación en Brasil

Eliane Guimarães de Oliveira¹

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5513-3287>

Claudio Pinto Nunes²

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1514-6961>

Abstract: This article presents an investigation into public policies aimed at professionals working in pedagogical coordination in Brazil and seeks to analyze, among other aspects, public policies that directly or indirectly relate to the work of professionals in coordination, from the concept of work to current legislation. Documentary research was used as the research tool, and the results demonstrate that, despite some achievements in current legislation, such as the guarantee of a National Professional Salary level in the Salary Law, there is still much progress to be made regarding public policies and the work of pedagogical coordination. Throughout Brazil's history, an imprecision and lack of clarity regarding the work of this professional can be observed in the analysis of legislation, starting with the very denomination of the role, which has numerous nomenclatures and responsibilities across different federated entities.

Keywords: Pedagogical coordinator. Brazilian education. Public policies.

Resumo: Este artigo apresenta uma investigação sobre as políticas públicas voltadas aos profissionais que atuam na coordenação pedagógica no Brasil e busca analisar, entre outros aspectos, as políticas públicas que se referem, direta ou indiretamente, ao trabalho dos profissionais que atuam na coordenação, desde a ideia do trabalho até as legislações em vigor. Como instrumento foi utilizada pesquisa documental e os resultados demonstram que, apesar de algumas conquistas em legislações em vigor, como a garantia de Piso Salarial Profissional Nacional na Lei do Piso, há muito o que se avançar no que se refere às políticas públicas e ao trabalho de coordenação pedagógica, pois o que se observa na análise de legislações, ao longo da história do Brasil, é uma imprecisão e falta de clareza no que se refere ao trabalho desse profissional, iniciando pela própria denominação da função, que tem inúmeras nomenclaturas e atribuições nos diferentes entes federados.

Palavras-chave: Coordenador pedagógico. Educação brasileira. Políticas públicas.

Resumen: Este artículo presenta una investigación sobre políticas públicas dirigida a profesionales que trabajan en coordinación pedagógica en Brasil y busca analizar, entre otros aspectos, políticas públicas que se refieren,

¹ Mestre em Educação pela Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia (UESB). Pedagoga da Universidade do Estado da Bahia (UNEB), campus Guanambi. E-mail: elianegbi@yahoo.com.br titular

² Doutro em Educação pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN). Professor Titular Pleno da Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia (UESB). Bolsista de Produtividade em Pesquisa do CNPq. E-mail: claudionunesba@hotmail.com.

directa o indirectamente, al trabajo de profesionales que trabajan en coordinación, desde la idea del trabajo a la legislación vigente. Como herramienta, se utilizó la investigación documental y los resultados muestran que, a pesar de algunos logros en la legislación actual, como la garantía de PSPN en la Ley sobre el Piso, hay mucho por hacer en términos de políticas públicas y el trabajo de coordinación pedagógica. , porque lo que se observa en el análisis de la legislación, a lo largo de la historia de Brasil, es una imprecisión y falta de claridad con respecto al trabajo de este profesional, comenzando con el nombre mismo de la función, que tiene numerosas nomenclaturas y atribuciones en diferentes entidades federado.

Palabras-clave: Coordinador pedagógico. Educación brasileña. Políticas públicas.

Introduction

The study presented here is a segment of a qualitative research project based on the approaches of Bogdan and Bicklen (1994). It focused on the work of the pedagogical coordinator, aiming to analyze, among other aspects, public policies that directly or indirectly relate to professionals working in pedagogical coordination.

According to Fernandes (2010), the pedagogical coordinator plays an important role in the daily activities of schools. They are involved in the collective articulation of the pedagogical political project, providing support and guidance to teachers, and organizing continuous training. Souza, Seixa, and Marques (2013) consider the coordinator as an agent of transformation within the school environment, as they work with the collective involved in the teaching-learning process and can contribute to the transformation of pedagogical practices.

In accordance with the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, Law No. 9.394/1996, the pedagogical coordinator is a professional in basic education, considered, according to Law No. 11.738/2008, as someone who performs "teaching activities or pedagogical support to teaching, such as management, planning, inspection, supervision, guidance, and educational coordination" (BRASIL, 2008).

Given the importance of the pedagogical coordinator in the educational context and the need for professional recognition, this article discusses public policies related to the work of the pedagogical coordinator. It analyzes the advancements and limitations of the legislation constructed over time, taking into account the political, economic, and social context.

To fulfill this purpose, we conducted a critical and contextualized analysis of Brazilian educational public policies that have implications for the work of the pedagogical coordinator. For this undertaking, we adopted Ball's (2001) concept of educational public policies, which considers policies as textual interventions that also carry material limitations and possibilities. The discussion utilized the influence context and the text production context approaches of the educational public policy cycle proposed by Ball and Bowe (1992, cited in MAINARDES, 2006).

According to the influence context approach, the text of a policy is constructed through a series of disputes among groups and institutions, where power relations prevail, favoring the interests

of some while excluding the voices of others. In this process, Ball (2001) discusses the power of the international context, its agencies and organizations, and their influence on various nations. Even in the context of globalization, these nations have the capacity to rework the proposed and/or imposed models.

The production context consists of analyzing the political text, which can be legislation or other documents. According to Mainardes (2006), these productions are not necessarily internally coherent and clear; they can also be contradictory. They may use key terms in different ways. The author argues that the political text under analysis needs to be read in relation to its specific time and place of production, as it is the result of disputes and agreements.

Based on these considerations, this study analyzes Brazilian educational legislation that has implications for the practice of pedagogical coordination, considering the historical, political, and economic context in which they were produced. We discuss the concept of pedagogical coordination implicit in the work of the mayor of studies during Jesuit education in Brazil, spanning various legislations from the 1920s to the 1970s, which introduced the figures of the inspector, the educational counselor, and the pedagogical supervisor. We then reach the 1990s when the term pedagogical coordinator gained strength and consolidated the responsibilities of different professionals, within a neoliberal socio-economic context with intensified work for teaching professionals.

The work of pedagogical coordination in Brazil: from the idea of coordination to the first legislations

When we observe the trajectory of pedagogical coordination work in Brazil, we notice that this professional has received various designations throughout history, and to this day, there is still a diversity of names in different federated entities.

Rangel (2000) explains the importance of studying and researching the terminology issue, which, in her view, is related to identity. According to the author, it is not a single name that remains, but rather a vocabulary, a set of terms that vary among states and schools. "This terminology includes expressions such as supervision, educational supervision, school supervision, pedagogical supervision, pedagogical guidance, coordination, pedagogical coordination, shift coordination, area or subject coordination" (RANGEL, 2000, p. 75).

Taking into account the definition of some terminologies, the author considers that coordination "implies creating and stimulating opportunities for common organization and integration of work at all stages" and "the pedagogical quality has, as a signifier, the study of educational practice" (RANGEL, 2000, p. 77).

Based on these considerations and discussions about the work of pedagogical coordination (PLACCO; ALMEIDA; SOUZA, 2011; SAVIANI, 2000; RANGEL, 2000), this text opts for the expression "pedagogical coordinator," understanding that it is the terminology used in Brazil, especially since the 1990s, replacing the term pedagogical/educational/school supervisor, which has not completely fallen into disuse and still remains in some Brazilian states and municipalities.

Based on Saviani's approaches (2000), we understand that even before being established in legislation as a profession, the idea of supervision was already present in the context of schools. In the Brazilian case, supervision has been taking place since Jesuit education through the figure of the mayor of studies. In the Jesuits' general plan, the "ratio studiorum," there were attributions of the mayor of studies, and the function was regulated by rules, including listening to and observing the teachers.

With the Pombaline Reform, through the Decree of June 28, 1759, the Jesuits were expelled from Brazil, and as a result, education taught by the priests ceased. As a replacement for the Jesuit educational system, royal classes were created (ROMANELLI, 1986). The figure of the mayor of studies ceased to exist, and the decree created the position of general director of studies in Portugal and all provinces, including Brazil, with the responsibilities of investigating the state of teaching and learning and making necessary interventions. Additionally, it was the director's duty to verify and correct the teachers' work, providing guidance and ensuring harmony among the educators (ANDRADE, 1978).

As observed in the legislation and according to Saviani (2000), the idea of supervision in this legislation promulgated by Portugal encompassed political-administrative aspects (inspection and direction), as well as the monitoring and control of teaching activities.

The first legislation on Brazilian education was the Law of October 15, 1827, promulgated during the imperial period shortly after Brazil's independence from Portugal. This law established primary schools in the most populous cities and provinces of Brazil. However, this legislation does not mention any professionals responsible for supervision or inspection, and the position of general director of studies ceased to exist.

Article 4 of the Law of October 15, 1827, states that "the schools shall use the mutual teaching method in the provincial capitals, and they shall also use it in the populous cities, towns, and places where it is possible to establish them" (BRASIL, 1827). According to Saviani (2000), in the mutual teaching method, the teacher assumes the roles of both teaching and supervision. In addition to teaching, the teacher also instructs, guides, and monitors the activities of monitors, who are the best students in the classes.

This type of teaching method was criticized by the Minister of the Empire, who, in a report submitted to the Chamber in 1834, questioned the results of mutual teaching and called for the creation

of the position of study inspector to perform activities such as conducting exams and inspecting schools (BRASIL, 1834).

In the municipality of Rio de Janeiro (then the capital) in 1854, the duties of conducting exams and inspecting schools were described as the responsibilities of the inspector general, as stated in a regulation approved by Decree No. 1,331-A on February 17. In addition to these duties, the inspector general, either personally or through delegates or a governing council, was tasked with supervising educational institutions, authorizing the opening of private schools, and reviewing textbooks (SAVIANI, 2000).

At the national level, public policies addressing the work of what we call pedagogical coordination have been absent since the formation of the Brazilian nation, spanning the entire imperial period until the Republic. In the early years of the Republic, there were initiatives to establish the role of inspectors in some states, such as the reform in São Paulo between 1892 and 1896. However, these initiatives were limited to certain federative entities and did not constitute national legislation.

According to Saviani (2000), in the 1920s some aspects were important in terms of contributions to the establishment of supervision as a profession. One aspect is the emergence of technical professionals in education, as well as the creation of the Brazilian Association in Education in 1924, which provided encouragement to educational technicians.

Another milestone at the federal level mentioned by Saviani is Decree No. 16,782-A, which established the National Department of Education and the National Education Council, assigning specific technical bodies to handle educational matters previously linked to the Ministry of the Empire and later to the Ministry of Justice and Interior Affairs.

The 1920s were marked by educational reforms, but they took place at the state level and were driven by Brazil's capitalist development process, which in turn accelerated urbanization and industrialization, leading to increased social pressures for education (SAVIANI, 2000).

Regarding the work of the inspector, the state of Pernambuco, for example, had an experience in 1928 with the reorganization of its organizational structure, separating the technical-pedagogical sectors from the administrative ones. Saviani (2000) considers that this separation between the administrative and technical parts was a condition for the emergence of the supervisor as a distinct figure from the principal and inspector. When the inspector's role shifted from supervision and control of teaching activities to pedagogical guidance, this professional came to be called a supervisor.

In contrast to the 1920s, the 1930s and 1940s saw educational policies by the federal government with influence on the activity we call pedagogical coordination. Saviani (2000) mentions the Francisco Campos Reform in 1931 and the Capanema Reform in 1942 and 1946 as important

legislations for the structuring/restructuring of Brazilian education, which would eventually lead to the first Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education in 1961.

According to Romanelli (1986), between 1930 and 1945, Brazil was governed by Getúlio Vargas, with these 15 years marked by a more unstable period (1930 to 1937) and a dictatorship (1937 to 1945) through the implementation of the Estado Novo (New State).

Regarding the Francisco Campos Reform, we highlight Decree No. 19,890, issued on April 18, 1931, which deals with the organization of Secondary Education. Title II of the Decree addresses the inspection of education, Chapter II deals with the inspection service, and Chapter III focuses on the inspectors. This emphasis is considered important because authors like Placco, Almeida, and Souza (2011) believe that the seed of pedagogical coordination in Brazil lies in school inspection.

Thus, the inspection of Secondary Education in Brazil was created through this legislation, which establishes the roles of inspectors and chief inspectors, who were subordinated to the National Department of Education. Their responsibilities included: the chief inspector was responsible for visiting and inspecting the work and material conditions in different districts, as well as resolving disagreements between school administrators and inspectors. The school inspector's responsibilities included monitoring classroom activities through visits to observe and inspect teaching methods, as well as supervising student activities and practices. They were also responsible for monitoring evaluation activities and documenting them in reports submitted to the Department of Education.

As observed, from a legislative perspective, the work of inspectors consisted of inspecting the physical and material conditions of schools, as well as monitoring the teaching work for recording and reporting to the National Department of Education through reports. The payment of inspectors was conditional upon the submission of such documents. There is no indication of guidance or training activities on the part of inspectors.

It is worth noting that Article 58 of the mentioned Decree establishes that appointment to the position of inspector should be based on a competitive examination, and the chief inspector would be chosen among the successful candidates of the competition, based on criteria such as attendance, capacity, and dedication to teaching.

The required qualification was the completion of secondary education, temporarily, as it would be replaced by a course offered at the Faculty of Education, Sciences, and Letters, established by the Statute of Brazilian Universities, instituted by Decree No. 19,851, dated April 11, 1931. Saviani (2000) explains that the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences, and Letters created the Pedagogy course, which trained teachers of specific subjects in the normal course and pedagogues, who were technicians and specialists in education, with a generalist pedagogue perspective, which was changed in the 1960s.

Before the 1960s, however, we highlight some legislations from 1940 that are related to the path of the pedagogical coordinator, who, in our view, since the 1990s, has assumed not only the role of supervisor but also that of educational counselor.

According to Romanelli (1986), during the Estado Novo (1937-1945), the regulation of education was implemented starting in 1942 with the Capanema Reform, under the name of Organic Laws of Education, established through Decree-Laws. Among these decrees, we highlight: Decree-Law No. 4,073, dated January 30, 1942, which organized industrial education; Decree-Law No. 4,244, dated April 9, 1942, which organized secondary education into two cycles, the ginásial with four years and the colegial with three years; and Decree-Law No. 6,141, dated December 28, 1943, which reformed commercial education.

None of these legislations mention inspectors or their work, as in Decree No. 19,890, dated April 18, 1931, which dealt with the inspection service and inspectors. However, these decrees from 1942 and 1943 include the service of educational counseling, which should be implemented in industrial, secondary, and commercial education, with the counselor being a teacher on the staff. For example, Article 41 of Decree-Law No. 6,141 states that educational and vocational guidance should be continuously coordinated with the teachers and, whenever possible, with the students' families. Currently, this responsibility falls under the role of the pedagogical coordinator in most educational networks.

The same educational counseling service also appears in Decree-Law No. 9,613, dated August 20, 1946, which organized agricultural education. Here, in the political scenario, there was no longer the Estado Novo but rather a provisional government.

In this year, we highlight Decree-Law No. 8,530, dated January 2, 1946, which organized normal education, which was taught in two cycles. The first cycle was the course for primary education teachers, which lasted four years, and the second cycle was the course for the training of primary school teachers, which lasted three years. Additionally, according to Article 3 of the mentioned Decree, normal education also included specialization courses for primary school teachers and qualification courses for primary school administrators. The latter was intended, according to Article 11, to "qualify school principals, educational counselors, school inspectors, statistical assistants, and responsible personnel for tests and school measurements" (BRASIL, 1946).

Upon examining Decree-Law No. 8,529, dated January 2, 1946, which organized primary education at the national level, we notice that it does not make any reference to the work of educational counselors and inspectors, but only to teachers and principals. Later, the Decree-Law that organized normal education introduced a specific course for the training of directors, inspectors, and counselors working in primary education.

We note that for secondary education, the figure of the inspector was established in 1931, with the function of overseeing the work of schools and teachers. However, this professional does not appear in the legislations of the 1940s, which now emphasize the need for an educational counselor, with the role of monitoring and guiding the students. During this period, primary education legislation does not include the figure of an inspector or educational counselor, even though normal education also aimed to train these professionals through the course for school administrators.

The work and public policies of educational coordination in Brazil: from inspection, guidance, and supervision to educational coordination.

In the 1950s, inspection in Brazil took on a modern character under the denomination of school supervision, influenced by strong American influence and the developmentalist policy, which attributed to education the function of a lever for social transformation. From 1957 to 1963, the process of training supervisors expanded through the Brazilian-American Program of Assistance to Elementary Education (PABAE), with an emphasis on teaching methods and techniques (LIMA, 2001). According to Arruda and Colares (2016), it was through this program that the American educational model with its emphasis on teaching techniques and methodologies began to be established in Brazil.

The supervisory action as control and oversight gained prominence in Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s during the military dictatorship regime, with the presence of technicism in education. The aim was to guarantee the efficiency and productivity of the educational process, which was achieved through rationalization involving planning under the control of supposedly qualified technicians, with teachers being relegated to a secondary role (LIMA, 2001).

In this context, according to Lima (2001), supervision gained space in educational legislation. The first Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, Law No. 4,024/1961, introduces the figure of the supervisor, but timidly, mentioning only normal education as a requirement for working in primary education without reference to career entry. The law addresses more specifically the education counselor in primary and secondary education and the inspector.

In studying the legislation, we note that there is a distinction between the levels of education, with differences in the training of professionals working in primary and secondary education. This is evident in Article 62, which states that the training of education counselors will be conducted in special courses that meet the conditions of the level of education and the social environment for which they are intended.

According to Article 52 of Law No. 4,024/1961, normal education was intended for the training of teachers, principals, education counselors, and supervisors in primary education. There is a specific

focus on the training of counselors, referred to as primary education counselors. According to Article 64, these professionals "will be trained in education institutes in a special course accessible to graduates from higher-level normal schools and education institutes, with a minimum of three years of experience in primary teaching" (BRASIL, 1961).

Regarding education counselors in secondary education, Article 63 mentions the spaces and training courses as follows:

Article 63. In philosophy faculties, a special course will be created for the training of education counselors in secondary education, which will be accessible to graduates in pedagogy, philosophy, psychology, or social sciences, as well as graduates in Physical Education from Higher Schools of Physical Education and federal education inspectors, all with a minimum of three years of teaching experience (BRASIL, 1961).

In this article, we observe that federal education inspectors could participate in a special course for the training of education counselors in secondary education, possibly as part of their professional development. According to the same law, the requirement for the position was to "possess technical and pedagogical knowledge demonstrated preferably in the performance of functions as an assistant to school administration or in the direction of an educational institution" (BRASIL, 1961). Interestingly, among supervisors, inspectors, and counselors, there is only a reference to the entry of inspectors, which was supposed to be through a public competitive examination based on tests and titles.

In the view of Placco, Almeida, and Souza (2011), legislations such as Law No. 4,024/1961, the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education were important in allowing schools to have a professional for pedagogical support. During this period and due to the legislation, experimental schools, which

[...] presented, in their innovative proposals, either a professional or a team, for pedagogical coordination. As the conditions of these schools were special, as a rule, the coordinator could do a good job in teacher training to achieve the objectives proposed by the schools (PLACCO; ALMEIDA; SOUZA, 2011, p. 32).

In addition to Law No. 4,024/1961, the 1960s, according to Placco, Almeida, and Souza, mark the Pedagogical Coordination, from the perspective of public policies, with Opinion 252/1969 (which complements Law 5,540/1968 - the Law of University Reform), which established the qualifications of the Pedagogy course, including School Supervision as one of the qualifications stipulated by the legislation, aiming at the training of School Supervisors, one of the education specialists.

Law No. 5,540/1968, which reformed higher education, in Article 30, emphasizes the need for higher education training for secondary school teachers and specialists, intended for planning, supervision, administration, inspection, and guidance work within schools and school systems, with the training taking place in universities.

Among the specialists, educational counselors have in Law No. 5,564/1968 a provision that addresses the exercise of the profession, defining their duties in Article 5, which include advising students and teaching subjects related to educational guidance. The training of this professional is maintained in this legislation, in accordance with Law No. 4,024/1961.

This training underwent changes with Opinion No. 252 of 1969, which gave rise to the qualifications of the Pedagogy course: administration, inspection, supervision, and guidance. According to Saviani (2000), Opinion 252/69 is the most radical attempt to professionalize the role of educational supervisor, although the idea had been pointed out since the reforms of the 1930s and had been regulated through Law No. 5,564/1968.

According to Arruda and Colares (2016), the opinion established functions for the activities carried out by pedagogues. The authors argue that the legislation abolished the formation of the generalist pedagogue and implemented specialized training, with a division of the functions performed by the pedagogue into technical specialties, sharing the tasks inherent to the educational process. In the authors' view, this movement of changes was driven by the Brazilian political and economic scenario, in which education was not immune to the capitalist development process of the country, influenced by the international context of the time (ARRUDA; COLARES, 2016).

Saviani (2000, p. 30) refers to the qualifications in the Pedagogy course implemented with Opinion 252/69 as:

[...] technicist pedagogy, whose objective was to guarantee the efficiency and productivity of the educational process, achieved through rationalization involving the planning of the process under the control of supposedly qualified technicians, relegating teachers to a secondary role as implementers.

There is a division in school work that is related to the political and economic context experienced in the country during that period, as stated by Pinheiro and Romanowski (2010, p. 146):

The training of specialists in the Pedagogy course was forged in the educational context of the time, which, due to the need for qualified labor to meet the capitalist mode of production, specifically aimed at the scientific division of labor in schools to increase productivity. At that time, the organization of the school was based on the principles of business administration. Pedagogical work adopted the principles of scientific management based on Taylor and Fayol.

Considering this political and economic context of the country, as well as Opinion 252 of 1969, the new Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education No. 5,692, enacted in 1971, addresses specialists and teachers in Chapter V, discussing aspects such as their training and career entry (BRASIL, 1971).

Specialists include administrators, supervisors, inspectors, and counselors, and they require a higher education degree to enter the profession, whether it is a short or long undergraduate program or postgraduate studies, both for primary and secondary education. The law provides for admission through public competitive exams and encourages ongoing professional development and updating by the education systems. Another point highlighted by the law is that the systems must establish remuneration based on qualifications, without distinction between the levels of work (BRASIL, 1971).

Placco, Almeida, and Souza (2011) explain that with the enactment of Law No. 5,692/1971 (which instituted the Reform of Primary and Secondary Education), the majority of Brazilian states,

[...] began to establish functions within the teaching staff that were committed to supervisory actions, both at the system and school unit levels. With different designations such as school supervisor, pedagogue, pedagogical advisor, CP, and coordinating teacher, education professionals found a new field of work (PLACCO; ALMEIDA; SOUZA, 2011, p. 32).

Saviani (2000) explains that as Pedagogy courses were being restructured due to legislation, questions also arose regarding the alleged neutrality of education, as well as the role of technicians. Rangel (2000) considers that in the 1960s and 1970s, supervision was conceived as a pedagogical specialty, with the role of ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the means and the effectiveness of the didactic-pedagogical work in the school. Like Saviani (2000), the author views this as a moment of technicism in supervision, understanding technicism as the decontextualized understanding and use of technique, which weakens the school and subjects it to the rules of socioeconomic policy interests.

According to Rangel (2000), the 1980s were a time of criticism of the school, with questioning of its role, and based on these reflections, there was a search for transformation. In this scenario, there was a need to remove the supervisor, from their training to their actions. As an example, the author mentions the experience in Rio de Janeiro, where supervisors were excluded from the Integrated Centers of Public Education (ICPE). In the same decade, the University of Rio de Janeiro restructured the Pedagogy course and removed the supervisor qualification, leaving that training for a specialization course.

In Santos's considerations (2012), the 1980s saw a strong critical movement in education, with the emergence of the Historical-Critical Pedagogy, led by Professor Dermeval Saviani. In this context,

[...] there were numerous debates about the denial of the so-called "technicians" or "education specialists," with the focus of criticism falling on them, particularly educational supervisors, as they were identified as the main responsible for the school's failure and the many problems in education (SANTOS, 2012, p. 44).

In the 1980s, a milestone was the Federal Constitution (FC) of 1988, which was developed in the context of political reopening in Brazil, and although it was designed by the elites (PERONI, 2003), it favored the growth of the struggle for the valorization of teaching, which achieved some achievements in the law, such as Principle V of education, as stated in Article 206 of the FC:

V - valorization of teaching professionals, guaranteed, by law, career plans for public teaching, with a professional salary floor and entry exclusively through public competitive exams based on exams and titles, ensuring a single legal framework for all institutions maintained by the Union (BRASIL, 1988).

If we consider Rangel's (2000) approaches, which consider teaching and learning as the supervisor's work - whom we refer to here as the pedagogical coordinator - we understand that the supervisor/coordinator, like the teacher, is a teaching professional.

We notice that the 1988 FC, unlike previous legislation, including the LDB (Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education), does not only focus on the entry of teaching professionals but also addresses career and remuneration, albeit with limitations, such as not referring to a national minimum wage, which was later amended by Constitutional Amendment No. 53 in 2006.

The teachers' struggle for improvements in education during the 1980s and the constitution-building process led to questions about the role of the supervisor, with educators accusing this professional of having a technician nature. Thus, starting in 1990, their role was redefined, and in some education systems, they gained the designation of pedagogical coordinator (LIMA, 2001).

It is interesting to consider that, despite all the questions and criticisms of the supervisor trained in Pedagogy courses with their qualifications, from a legislative standpoint, Opinion 252 of 1969 remains in effect, and this is only changed in 2006 with the promulgation of the National Curriculum Guidelines for Pedagogy courses, which aim to train educators for teaching in early childhood education and the early grades of elementary education, as well as for management and coordination of educational processes (BRASIL, 2006).

It is also important to think about the political and economic context of the 1990s, a period in which the role of the supervisor was modified in Brazil, and in many education networks, even the designation was changed to pedagogical coordinator.

Peroni (2003) explains that between 1965 and 1973, the crisis of the Fordist production model that sustains the welfare state worsens, and in this process, capitalism reinvents itself through neoliberalism, referred to by Harvey (1992) as flexible accumulation, with changes in the mode of production and labor relations. In this new neoliberal scenario, the state reduces its role and becomes minimal for social policies, but it becomes maximum for capital, as it regulates the activities of corporate capital and has to create a favorable business climate to attract and retain investors.

In this process, there is a strengthening of financial systems with the globalization of capital. Peroni (2003) highlights the transposition of this system to countries like Brazil, which is subordinate to the world system, having a capitalist particularity due to its colonial, slaveholding, and conservative genesis, being constituted as a Nation-State based on contradictions.

In a delayed manner, this model of flexible accumulation reached Brazil in the 1990s, primarily under the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC), who implemented the State reform, proposing the replacement of bureaucratic public administration with managerial administration that utilizes market logic, decentralizing social services such as education in the logic of neoliberalism. In this market-driven education model, education professionals are increasingly held responsible for the outcomes of the educational process, resulting in situations of workload accumulation and overload.

We can observe a close relationship between neoliberal reforms in Latin American countries, such as the FHC government in Brazil, and documents from international agencies, such as the report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1995), *Governance in Transition: Public Management Reforms in OECD Countries*. Regarding the report, Ball (2001) considers that it blends description and prescription and summarizes the reforms as the new paradigms of public management:

- Greater focus on results in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of services;
- Replacement of deeply centralized and hierarchical organizational structures with decentralized management environments, where decisions regarding resource allocation and service provision are made much closer to the point of delivery and where conditions are created for feedback from clients and other interest groups;
- Flexibility to explore alternatives for public provision and regulation that can, in turn, lead to more cost-effective outcomes;
- Increased emphasis on the efficiency of services directly provided by the public sector, involving the establishment of productivity goals and the creation of competitive environments within and between public sector organizations;
- Strengthening of strategic skills of central power that lead to the evolution of the state and enable it to respond to external challenges and diverse interests in an automatic, flexible, and cost-effective manner (BALL, 2001, p. 104).

Ball (2001) examines the extent to which we are witnessing the disappearance of the conception of specific policies of the Nation-State in the economic, social, and educational fields and their inclusion in a single field under a unified conception of policy for economic competitiveness, leading to the abandonment or marginalization of the social purposes of education. In this scenario, Ball considers that education is increasingly subject to prescriptions and norms driven by economism.

In this logic, we understand why the consequences of the flexible accumulation regime for workers (such as increased unemployment, subcontracting, and weakening of unions) also affect

teaching professionals, with education becoming increasingly subjugated to the economic field. In this context, as Oliveira (2004) explains, the reforms implemented,

[...] will ultimately determine a restructuring of teaching work, resulting from the combination of different factors present in the management and organization of school work, leading to greater accountability for teachers and increased community involvement (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 1131).

In this context, considering Ball's (2001) approaches that view the creation of national policies as a process of bricolage, borrowing fragments and parts of ideas from other contexts, the new Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, Law No. 9,394/1996, introduced the neoliberal discourse, highlighting democratic and decentralized management, as well as policies of evaluation and accountability for teachers, who are now expected to assume not only the role of teaching but also planning, managing, and coordinating.

From this legislation, it becomes evident that the activity of pedagogical coordination is a function of teaching. We observe that the term "pedagogical coordination" appears in Law No. 9,394/1996, and here the pedagogical coordinator is treated as an education professional. In Article 61, amended by Law 13,415/2017, among the education professionals, we have: "education workers holding a pedagogy degree with qualifications in administration, planning, supervision, inspection, and educational guidance, as well as master's or doctoral degrees in the same areas," and "education workers holding a technical or higher education degree in the pedagogical field or related areas" (BRASIL, 1996).

The same law, in Article 64, determines that the training of education professionals for administration, planning, inspection, supervision, and educational guidance for basic education should be conducted in undergraduate Pedagogy programs or at the postgraduate level, at the discretion of the educational institution, ensuring a common national foundation in this training (BRASIL, 1996).

In addition to undergraduate or postgraduate education, Article 67, § 1º (renumbered by Law No. 11,301/2006), of Law No. 9,394/1996, considers teaching experience as a prerequisite for the professional practice of any other teaching functions, and § 2º, included by Law 11,301/2006, considers as teaching functions in basic education those performed by teachers and education specialists in this field, whether in teaching or in activities related to school management, coordination, and pedagogical advisory.

From a legislative perspective, we can see that the pedagogical coordinator does not have a specified designation. Although the term "coordination" appears in the text of the Law of Guidelines and Bases, many other terms are mentioned as related to the activity, including education professionals, specialists, thus maintaining the imprecision that has always been present in the trajectory of this

profession. We believe that the law has, to some extent, maintained what was still in effect with Opinion 252/1969 while seeking to incorporate the new discourses prevalent in the 1990s.

Regarding the work of the pedagogical coordinator, we consider it an advancement in the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB) 9,394/1996 for the coordinator to be treated as an education professional who performs one of the teaching functions, alongside teaching and school management. Another advancement for the work of pedagogical coordination is the principle of valuing education professionals, already expressed in the 1988 Constitution and expanded in the new LDB, as stated in Article 67:

The education systems will promote the valorization of education professionals, guaranteeing them, including according to the statutes and career plans of public teaching:

- I - entry exclusively through public competitive exams;
- II - continuous professional development, including periodic paid leave for this purpose;
- III - professional salary level;
- IV - career progression based on academic degrees or qualifications and performance evaluation;
- V - dedicated time for study, planning, and evaluation, included in the workload;
- VI - suitable working conditions (BRASIL, 1996).

From a legislative standpoint, the fact that the pedagogical coordinator is considered a teaching professional represents an important advancement for the coordinator's career, despite the limitations that still exist, such as the debate about whether the coordinator should be considered a specialist with a technical role, which leads to divergent views on the professional career. In our understanding, the work of the coordinator is essentially political (OLIVEIRA, 2019; OLIVEIRA; NUNES, 2020; OLIVEIRA; NUNES, 2018; NUNES; OLIVEIRA, 2017; TOZETTO; STEFANELLO, 2022), as Saviani already stated in a Conference delivered at the II National Meeting of Supervisors in 1979 (SAVIANI, 2000).

We agree with the statements of Arruda and Colares (2016) when they express the need to reaffirm the political position that the coordinator holds. The authors consider that the coordinator's work goes beyond being technical-administrative, as it is often understood. It involves planned and organized action with clear objectives and is a political factor.

We do not see the pedagogical coordinator's role as that of a specialist since their current training is the same as that of teachers, meaning there is no specificity in their training process. Furthermore, we also do not agree with attributing the coordinator's activity as technical-administrative since they work with education, which makes them a teacher as well.

Based on these considerations, we believe there is a need for a change in the Constitution, specifically in Article 201, replacing the term "teacher" with "education professionals," considering that public policies since the 1990s and 2000s have started to use this terminology, treating the rights of teaching functions, including teaching, coordination, and management, equally.

Analyzing the Law of Guidelines and Bases (LDB) No. 9,394/1996, we understand that its text has implications for the intensification of teaching work, both in the classroom and in pedagogical coordination spaces. The lack of clarity regarding the teacher's work in the role of pedagogical coordination in the legislation has led to changes in state laws. Some federative entities, such as the State of Bahia, following the guidelines of the LDB, merged the functions previously carried out by educational counselors and supervisors into the activity of pedagogical coordination. According to Pires (2005, p. 41), "in the State Public Education Network of Bahia, in 1997, the positions of educational counselor and school supervisor were transformed into positions of pedagogical coordinator, who currently performs the functions of the transformed nomenclatures."

Among the legislations subsequent to the 1988 Constitution, we highlight Law No. 10,172 of 2001, which approves the National Education Plan, which was in effect from 2001 to 2011. The said law presents, in addition to the diagnosis, guidelines, objectives, and goals for levels and modalities of education, basic education teaching, financing and management, and plan monitoring and evaluation.

In the introduction of the 2001-2011 National Education Plan (PNE), the objectives and priorities of the plan are presented, among which we highlight Priority IV:

4. Valorization of education professionals. Special attention should be given to initial and continuous training, especially for teachers. This valorization includes guaranteeing adequate working conditions, including time for study and lesson preparation, dignified salaries with a minimum wage and a teaching career (BRASIL, 2001).

We notice that the document addresses the valorization of education professionals, including the pedagogical coordinator, and the concept of valorization advocated in the PNE includes not only teacher training but also working conditions, career, and remuneration. However, as the text emphasizes, there is a priority given to the issue of training, and the objectives and goals explicitly state this preference by defining 25 out of 28 specific goals and objectives for teacher training.

Among the objectives and goals of Priority IV in the 2001-2011 PNE, which deals with basic education teaching, only three refer to working conditions, career, and remuneration.

- I. Ensure the implementation, starting from the first year of this plan, of career plans for teaching, developed and approved in accordance with the provisions of Law No. 9,424/96, and the creation of new plans in case the old ones have not been reformulated according to that law. Also ensure new levels of

remuneration in all education systems, with their own minimum salary according to the guidelines established by the National Council of Education, ensuring promotion based on merit.

2. Gradually implement a full-time workday, when appropriate, fulfilled in a single school establishment.
3. Allocate between 20 and 25% of teachers' workload for lesson preparation, assessments, and pedagogical meetings (BRASIL, 2001).

Although limited, the objectives and goals related to working conditions, career, and remuneration are important achievements for professionals in basic education teaching, including the pedagogical coordinator. To achieve these objectives, as well as the other objectives and goals related to other areas, the funding provided in the PNE would be crucial. However, as questioned by Saviani (2014), the veto by President Fernando Henrique Cardoso of all articles related to funding made the PNE unfeasible.

Another important legal milestone for improving working conditions of professionals in basic education teaching was the Salary Law (Lei do Piso). We consider the right to the National Professional Salary level (PSPN) a victory for education professionals, including the pedagogical coordinator, which became possible with Constitutional Amendment No. 53 of 2006, which establishes the creation of the Fund for the Maintenance and Development of Basic Education and Valorization of Education Professionals (FUNDEB), replacing the Fund for the Maintenance and Development of Elementary Education and Valorization of Teaching Professionals (FUNDEF), which had been in effect since 1997.

It is important to highlight the context in which these events occurred. In 2002, the neoliberal government showed signs of exhaustion, and Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, a progressive president who had made alliances with the elites, was elected in Brazil. The election of the new president enabled the organization and action of teacher movements, such as the National Confederation of Education Workers, which was fundamental in the process of debates, confrontations, and proposals in the establishment of the national professional salary legislation.

The creation of the salary level was determined in Law No. 11,494 of 2007, enacted through Law No. 11,378/2008, but it was contested by some governors, although it was deemed constitutional by the Federal Supreme Court.

Continuing with the progressive government's administration since 2002, we had the enactment of Law No. 13,005/2014, the National Education Plan (PNE), which was the result of intense discussions among various segments of society in municipal, state, and national conferences, creating a reference document for the PNE (OLIVEIRA, 2011).

The PNE, enacted in 2014 during Dilma Rousseff's government, established important goals and strategies regarding the improvement of working conditions, remuneration, career, and training for public education professionals in basic education, including the pedagogical coordinator. According

to Nunes and Oliveira (2017, p. 76), "the commitment to fulfilling the goals and strategies of the National Education Plan, Law 13,005/2014 (BRASIL, 2014), for the next ten years, is fundamental."

We highlight among the goals of the PNE that have impacts on the work of the pedagogical coordinator: 15 (teacher training), 16 (continuous training and postgraduate education for teachers), 17 (teacher valorization), 18 (teaching career plan), 19 (democratic management), and 20 (education funding).

Goal 15 provides for education professionals' training policy, as stated in Article 61 of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB). Goal 16 emphasizes the need for postgraduate education for teachers and guarantees continuous training for all education professionals. Goal 17 addresses the remuneration of education professionals, aiming to align it with other professionals with equivalent education. Goal 18 focuses on the need to establish career plans for education professionals, taking the national professional salary level as the basis for basic education professionals. Lastly, Goal 20 is crucial to ensuring the effectiveness of all goals, as it pertains to education funding, defining the expansion of investments, which is essential.

The National Education Plan (PNE) represented hope for improving working conditions, remuneration, greater valorization, and training for education professionals. Although it is still in effect, the belief in its implementation diminished in the face of the country's political scenario, which experienced a political coup in 2016 with the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff.

In Braz's view (2017), the coup occurred because they considered Dilma incapable of continuing to represent the interests of capital that she had served. They needed a genuinely bourgeois government that would not yield even the slightest to the workers but, on the contrary, would take away what little they had achieved and serve capital to the maximum.

The government of Michel Temer, who assumed power after Dilma Rousseff's departure, precisely executed this expected project. As a consequence, we have Constitutional Amendment No. 95, which limits public spending on education and healthcare for 20 years, as well as labor reform.

In 2018, Jair Messias Bolsonaro, an extreme right-wing government, was elected and continued the execution of a conservative agenda, including actions such as the approval of pension reform (Constitutional Amendment No. 103/2019) and a proposed constitutional amendment for administrative reform, among others. In this project, we experience daily attacks on education, such as budget constraints, reduced funding, and a lack of appreciation for the humanities, among others (GRISA, 2019). If we observe the political and economic context, we can see that this conservative agenda is not exclusive to Brazil but is present throughout Latin America, as it becomes a priority among the imperialist interests of the international economy.

Final considerations

We can observe that the work of the pedagogical coordinator is of fundamental importance for the development of teaching and learning activities in schools, considering that their role is to organize spaces and times for ongoing training and to coordinate pedagogical work.

For the work of the pedagogical coordinator to be effective, it is essential that they are valued, which implies considering policies related to their training, working conditions, career, and remuneration.

The study of public policies in Brazil focused on the work of the pedagogical coordinator demonstrates a concerning situation, as there seems to be a lack of clarity about the role of this professional. Despite some advances in legislation, such as the Salary Law and FUNDEB, which consider coordinators as education professionals entitled to the national professional salary, funded by FUNDEB, there is much to be reconsidered regarding the pedagogical coordinator in public policies. To begin with, there is an imprecision that starts with the very denomination of the professional, which, in our understanding, is related to the construction of identity, a topic that requires further study.

The current Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (Law No. 9394/1996) highlights the imprecision when referring to various names such as coordination, supervision, and guidance. We understand that there is no clarity about who these professionals are and what each of their roles entails. We only have the information that they are those who work in planning, monitoring, and supporting teaching work.

What is evident in the 1996 LDB, promulgated in a context of intensification of teaching work, is that the coordination activity must be carried out by a teacher, as teaching is a prerequisite for performing other teaching functions. The training of these professionals must occur in Pedagogy courses or other teaching degree programs, with postgraduate education. The National Curricular Guidelines for initial teacher training, Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2019, promulgated in December 2019, clarify that, in the case of Pedagogy courses, the training should be complementary, adding approximately 400 hours to the course workload, and in the case of postgraduate education, it should be in specific courses in the field, whether in specializations, master's or doctoral degrees.

Apart from the clarity regarding training and the need for teaching experience, we do not have, in the National Plan, legislation that regulates the work of the pedagogical coordinator, sometimes referred to as such, sometimes as a supervisor, among others. All these imprecisions in the National Plan end up, in our view, generating a multitude of names and roles for these professionals in the various federal entities.

Considering this scenario, coordinators face important challenges to be addressed, such as advocating for national policies that ensure greater clarity regarding the pedagogical coordination work, better working conditions, remuneration, and the guarantee of career plans for greater valorization. Alongside these specific demands, we are experiencing a context of eroding labor rights that were hard-won, which is why resistance is necessary so that public policies for teaching, such as the national professional salary, are not abolished.

In this sense, we understand that investigations into public policies and the work of the pedagogical coordinator are fundamental to support the struggles for their valorization. Our study represents one perspective among many others that can be explored on this subject.

References

ANDRADE, A. A. B. de. "Apêndice Documental". In: **A reforma pombalina dos estudos secundários no Brasil**. São Paulo: Saraiva, Ed. da Universidade de São Paulo, 1978.

ARRUDA, E. P.; COLARES, M. L. I. S. A coordenação pedagógica e seu movimento histórico. In: **O coordenador pedagógico no cotidiano da gestão escolar**. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2016.

BALL, S. J. Diretrizes políticas globais e relações políticas locais em educação. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, Belo Horizonte, v.1, n.2, p. 99-116, Jul./Dec. 2001. Disponível em: <https://gestaoeducacaoespecial.ufes.br/sites/gestaoeducacaoespecial.ufes.br/files/field/anexo/ball.pdf> Acesso em: 22.05.2022

BOGDAN, R.; BIKLEN, S. K. **Investigação qualitativa em educação**. Tradução de Maria João Alvarez, Sara Bahia dos Santos e Telmo Mourinho Baptista. Portugal: Porto Editora, 1994.

BRASIL. **Lei de 15 de outubro de 1827**. Manda crear escolas de primeiras letras em todas as cidades, villas e logares mais populosos do Imperio. Rio de Janeiro, 1827. Available at: http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei_sn/1824-1899/lei-38398-15-outubro-1827-566692-publicacaooriginal-90222-pl.html. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Ministério do Império. Ministro (Antônio Pinto Chichorro da Gama). **Relatório... do ano de 1833 apresentado à assembleia geral legislativa na sessão ordinária de 1834**. Rio de Janeiro: Assembleia Geral Legislativa, 1834. (publicado em 1834). Available at: http://memoria.bn.br/pdf/720968/per720968_1833_00001.pdf. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 1.331-A, de 17 de fevereiro de 1854**. Approva o Regulamento para a reforma do ensino primario e secundario do Municipio da Côrte. Rio de Janeiro, 1854. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/1824-1899/decreto-1331-a-17-fevereiro-1854-590146-publicacaooriginal-115292-pe.html> Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 19.851, de 11 de abril de 1931**. Dispõe que o ensino superior no Brasil obedecerá, de preferencia, ao systema universitario, podendo ainda ser ministrado em institutos isolados, e que a organização technica e administrativa das universidades é instituida no presente Decreto, regendo-se os institutos isolados pelos respectivos regulamentos, observados os dispositivos do seguinte Estatuto das Universidades Brasileiras. Rio de Janeiro, 1931. Available at:

<http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/1930-1939/decreto-19851-11-abril-1931-505837-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Decreto nº 19.890, de 18 de abril de 1931. Dispõe sobre a organização do ensino secundário. Rio de Janeiro, 1931. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/1930-1939/decreto-19890-18-abril-1931-504631-publicacaooriginal-141245-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2018.

BRASIL. Decreto Lei nº 4.073, de 30 de janeiro de 1942. Lei orgânica do ensino industrial. Rio de Janeiro, 1942. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-4073-30-janeiro-1942-414503-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Decreto Lei nº 4.242, de 9 de abril de 1942. Lei orgânica do ensino secundário. Rio de Janeiro, 1942. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-4244-9-abril-1942-414155-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2018.

BRASIL. Decreto nº Lei 6.141, de 28 de dezembro de 1943. Lei Orgânica do Ensino Comercial. Rio de Janeiro, 1943. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-6141-28-dezembro-1943-416183-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Decreto nº Lei 8.529, de 2 de janeiro de 1946. Lei Orgânica do Ensino Primário. . Rio de Janeiro, 1946. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-8529-2-janeiro-1946-458442-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Decreto nº Lei 8.530, de 2 de janeiro de 1946. Lei Orgânica do Ensino Normal. Rio de Janeiro, 1946. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-8530-2-janeiro-1946-458443-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Decreto nº Lei 9.613, de 20 de agosto de 1946. Lei Orgânica do Ensino Agrícola. Rio de Janeiro, 1946. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-9613-20-agosto-1946-453681-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Accessed on: 05.10.2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 4.024 de 20 de dezembro de 1961. Fixa as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, 1961. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9394.htm. Accessed on: 07.10.2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 5.540 de 28 de novembro de 1968. Fixa normas de organização e funcionamento do ensino superior e sua articulação com a escola média, e dá outras providências. Brasília, 1968. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/1960-1969/lei-5540-28-novembro-1968-359201-publicacaooriginal-1-pl.html>. Accessed on: 07.10.2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 5.564 de 21 de dezembro de 1968. Provê sobre o exercício da profissão de orientador educacional. Brasília, 1968. Available at: <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/1960-1969/lei-5564-21-dezembro-1968-358617-norma-pl.html>. Accessed on: 07.10.2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 5.692 de 20 de dezembro de 1971. Fixa Diretrizes e Bases para o ensino de 1º e 2º graus, e dá outras providências. Brasília: Presidência da República, 1971. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9394.htm. Accessed on: 07.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil**. Brasília, DF: Senado, 1988. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicaocompilado.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional** - Lei nº 9.394 de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996. Brasília, DF, 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9394.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 9.424 de 24 de dezembro de 1996**. Dispõe sobre o Fundo de Manutenção e Desenvolvimento do Ensino Fundamental e de Valorização do Magistério, na forma prevista no art. 60, § 7º, do Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias, e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996. Brasília, 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9424.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 10.172, de 09 de janeiro de 2001**. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2001. Brasília, 2001. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/setec/arquivos/pdf_legislacao/tecnico/legisla_tecnico_lei10172.pdf. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Emenda Constitucional nº 53 de 19 de dezembro de 2006**. Dá nova redação aos arts. 7º, 23, 30, 206, 208, 211 e 212 da Constituição Federal e ao art. 60 do Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2006. Brasília, 2006. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/emendas/emc/emc53.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Resolução CNE/CP nº 1 de 15 de maio de 2006**. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Curso de Graduação em Pedagogia, licenciatura. Brasília, 2006. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rcp01_06.pdf. Accessed on: 05.10.2018.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 11.494 de 20 de junho de 2007**. Brasília, 2007. Regulamenta o Fundo de Manutenção e Desenvolvimento da Educação Básica e de Valorização dos Profissionais da Educação - FUNDEB, de que trata o art. 60 do Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias; altera a Lei nº 10.195, de 14 de fevereiro de 2001; revoga dispositivos das Leis nºs 9.424, de 24 de dezembro de 1996, 10.880, de 9 de junho de 2004, e 10.845, de 5 de março de 2004; e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2007. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2007/lei/11494.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 11.738 de 16 de julho de 2008**. Regulamenta a alínea “e” do inciso III do caput do art. 60 do Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias, para instituir o piso salarial profissional nacional para os profissionais do magistério público da educação básica. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2008. Brasília, 2008. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/11738.htm. Accessed on: 06.10.2022.

BRASIL. **Plano Nacional de Educação (PNE): Lei nº 13.005 de 25 de julho de 2014**. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação - PNE e dá outras providências. 2. ed. Brasília: Edições Câmara, 2014.

BRASIL. **Emenda Constitucional nº 95 de 15 de dezembro de 2016**. Altera o Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias, para instituir o Novo Regime Fiscal, e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2016. Brasília, 2016. Available at:

http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/Emendas/Emc/emc95.htm. Accessed on: 03.10.2022.

BRASIL. Emenda constitucional nº 103 de 12 de novembro de 2019. Altera o sistema de previdência social e estabelece regras de transição e disposições transitórias. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2019. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/emendas/emc/emc103.htm. Accessed on: 03.10.2022.

BRASIL. Resolução CNE/CP nº 2 de 20 de dezembro de 2019. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e institui a Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica (BNC-Formação). Brasília, 2019. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/dezembro-2019-pdf/135951-rcp002-19/file>. Accessed on: 03.10.2022.

BRAZ, M. O golpe nas ilusões democráticas e a ascensão do conservadorismo reacionário. **Serv. Soc. Soc.**, São Paulo, n. 128, p. 85-103, Jan./Apr. 2017. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ssoc/a/J74WJRdJH6sHMHC9MhSDc8Q/?format=pdf&lang=pt> Acesso em: 22.05.2022.

FERNANDES, M. J. da S. Coordenador pedagógico. In: OLIVEIRA, D. A.; VIEIRA, L. M. F. **Dicionário: trabalho, profissão e condição docente.** Belo Horizonte: UFMG/Faculdade de Educação, 2010. Available at: <http://www.gestrado.net.br/?pg=dicionario-verbetes&id=430>. Accessed on: 06.13.2022.

GRISA, G. D. Uma política de cortes: A educação merece mais. **Jornal Le Monde Diplomatique Brasil**, 147 ed., 1 out. 2019. Available at: <https://diplomatique.org.br/a-educacao-merece-mais/>. Accessed on: 03.10.2022.

HARVEY, D. **A Condição pós-moderna: uma pesquisa sobre as origens da mudança cultural.** Tradução de Adail Ubirajara Sobral e Maria Stela Gonçalves. São Paulo: Loyola, 1992.

LIMA, E. C. de. Um olhar histórico sobre a supervisão. In: RANGEL, M. (org.). **Supervisão pedagógica: princípios e práticas.** São Paulo: Papirus, 2001. p. 69-78.

MAINARDES, J. Abordagem do ciclo de políticas: uma contribuição para a análise de políticas educacionais. **Educ. Soc.**, Campinas, v. 27, n. 94, p. 47-69, Jan./Apr. 2006. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/NGFTXWNtTvxytCQHCJFyhsj/?format=pdf&lang=pt> Acesso em: 22.05.2022.

NUNES, C. P.; OLIVEIRA, D. A. de. Trabalho, carreira, desenvolvimento docente e mudança na prática educativa. **Educ. Pesqui.**, São Paulo, v. 43, n.1, p. 65-80, Jan./Mar. 2017. Available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S1517-97022016005003105&script=sci_abstract&tlng=pt. Accessed on: 11.19.2022.

OLIVEIRA, D. A. de. A reestruturação do trabalho docente: precarização e flexibilização. **Educ. Soc.**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 89, p. 1127-1144, Sep./Dec. 2004. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/NM7Gfq9ZpjpVcJnsSFdrM3F/?format=pdf&lang=pt> Acesso em: 22.05.2022.

OLIVEIRA, D. A. de. Das políticas de governo a política de estado: reflexões sobre a atual agenda educacional brasileira. **Educ. Soc.**, Campinas, v. 32, n. 115, p. 323-337, Apr./Jun. 2011. Disponível em:

Olhar de professor, Ponta Grossa, v. 26, p. 1-25, e-2110.057, 2023.
Disponível em <<https://revistas2.uepg.br/index.php/olhardeprofessor>>

<https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/hMQyS6LdCNDK8tHk8gL3Z6B/?format=pdf&lang=pt> Acesso em: 22.05.2022.

OLIVEIRA, E. G. de. **As condições de trabalho do coordenador pedagógico no Território Sertão Produtivo da Bahia**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia, PPGEd/UESB, Vitória da Conquista, BA, 2019. Disponível em: <http://www2.uesb.br/ppg/ppged/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ELIANE-GUIMAR%C3%83ES-DE-OLIVEIRA.pdf> Acesso em: 20.04.2022.

OLIVEIRA, E. G. de; NUNES, C. P. Perfil e condições de trabalho do coordenador pedagógico no Território Sertão Produtivo da Bahia. **Interfaces da Educação**, v. 11, n. 22. 2020. Available at: <https://periodicosonline.uems.br/index.php/interfaces/article/view/4284>. Accessed on: 09.13. 2022.

OLIVEIRA, E. G. de; NUNES, C. P. Mapeamento das produções acadêmicas sobre condições de trabalho do coordenador pedagógico (2012 a 2016). **Revista Exitus**, v. 8, n. 3, p. 224-253, 2018. DOI: 10.24065/2237-9460.2018v8n3ID645. Available at: <http://www.ufopa.edu.br/portaldeperiodicos/index.php/revistaexitus/article/view/645>. Accessed on : 09.13. 2022.

PERONI, V. M. V. Breves Considerações sobre a redefinição do papel do estado. In: PERONI, V. M. V. (org.). **Política educacional e papel do estado no Brasil dos anos 1990**. São Paulo: Xamã, 2003.

PINHEIRO, G. C. G.; ROMANOWSKI, J. P. Curso de Pedagogia: formação do professor da educação infantil e dos anos séries iniciais do ensino fundamental. **Form. Doc.**, Belo Horizonte, v. 2, n. 3, p. 136-151, Aug./Dec. 2010. Disponível em: <file:///C:/Users/Germinio%20Jos%C3%A9%20Silva/Downloads/23-Texto%20do%20artigo-72-73-10-20180518.pdf> Acesso em: 25.06.2022.

PIRES, E. D. P. B. **A prática do coordenador pedagógico: limites e perspectivas**. 2005. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Faculdade de Educação, Campinas, SP, 2005. Disponível em: Acesso em:

PLACCO, V. M. N. de S.; ALMEIDA, L. R. de; SOUZA, V. L. T. de. **O coordenador Pedagógico (CP) e a formação de professores: intenções, tensões e contradições**. Fundação Victor Civita, 2011. Available at: <http://www.fvc.org.br>. Accessed on: 11. 01. 2022.

RANGEL, M. Supervisão: do sonho à ação – uma prática em transformação. In: FERREIRA, N. S. C. (org.). **Supervisão educacional para uma escola de qualidade**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000. p. 69-96.

ROMANELLI, O. de O. **História da educação no Brasil (1930-1973)**. 8. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1986.

SANTOS, M. P. dos S. **História da supervisão educacional no Brasil: reflexões sobre política, pedagogia e docência**. Rio de Janeiro: Wak, 2012.

SAVIANI, D. A supervisão educacional em perspectiva histórica: da função à profissão pela mediação da ideia. In: FERREIRA, N. S. C. (org.). **Supervisão educacional para uma escola de qualidade**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000. p. 13-38.

SAVIANI, D. **Sistema Nacional de Educação e Plano Nacional de Educação**. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2014.

Olhar de professor, Ponta Grossa, v. 26, p. 1-25, e-21110.057, 2023.
Disponível em <<https://revistas2.uepg.br/index.php/olhardeprofessor>>

SOUZA, F. J. de; SEIXAS, G. O.; MARQUES, T. G. O coordenador pedagógico e sua identidade profissional. **Práxis Educacional**. Vitória da Conquista, v. 9, n. 15, p. 39-56 Jul./Dec. 2013. Available at: <http://periodicos2.uesb.br/index.php/praxis/article/view/747>. Accessed on: 11. 21. 2022.

TOZETTO, S. S.; STEFANELLO, F. A. C. Coordenadores pedagógicos e suas estratégias de apoio aos professores iniciantes. **Práxis Educacional**, v. 18, n. 49, p. e9282, 2022. DOI: 10.22481/praxisedu.v18i49.9282. Available at: <https://periodicos2.uesb.br/index.php/praxis/article/view/9282>. Accessed on: 11. 21. 2022.

Recebido: 14/10/2022

Aceito: 07/06/2023

Received: 10/14/2022

Accepted: 06/07/2023

Recibido: 14/10/2022

Aceptado: 07/06/2023

