

ARTICLE

SPECIALIZED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE IN FULL-TIME SCHOOLS¹

AMANDA SANTANA GOMES-SILVA¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0425-5601>

<amandasgs@estudante.ufscar.br>

ENICÉIA GONÇALVES MENDES¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3673-0681>

<egmendes@ufscar.br>

¹ Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar). São Carlos (SP), Brasil.

ABSTRACT: Contemporary proposals for inclusive and sustainable educational policies, such as Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education and Full-Time Integral Education, are essential to overcome inequalities. Brazilian educational policies recommend offering Specialized Educational Services (SES) to students in the Special Education population after school hours, as well as providing for an increase in the provision of Full-Time Education. This study aimed to analyze how the SES works in full-time schools, given that students must remain in the educational unit for an average of seven hours, and consequently lose their rights to either SES or full participation in their class activities. Data collection involved documents, questionnaires and systematic observation and interviews with teachers from three full-time schools with special education students enrolled. The results, limited to interviews with regular education and SES teachers, suggest that the Integral Education and Special Education policies have purposes and goals that are congruent; however, in practice there are still conflicts between the two policies, which demand a redefinition of SES.

Keywords: special education, educational public policies, policy cycle approach, specialized educational assistance, integral education.

ATENDIMENTO EDUCACIONAL ESPECIALIZADO EM ESCOLAS DE TEMPO INTEGRAL

RESUMO: As propostas contemporâneas de políticas educacionais inclusivas e sustentáveis, como a da Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva e da Educação Integral em Tempo Integral, são fundamentais para a superação de desigualdades. Aos estudantes do público da Educação Especial as políticas educacionais brasileiras recomendam a oferta de Atendimento Educacional Especializado (AEE) no contraturno escolar, assim como, preveem o aumento da oferta de Educação em Tempo

¹ The Editors participating in the open peer review process: Suzana dos Santos Gomes, Josiane Pereira Torres and Jaima Pinheiro de Oliveira.

Integral. O presente estudo visou analisar como o AEE funciona em escolas de tempo integral, dado que o estudante deve permanecer por sete horas-relógio, em média na unidade educacional, e consequentemente com perdas de direitos, ou ao AEE ou à participação plena nas atividades da turma. A coleta de dados envolveu documentos, questionários e observação sistemática e entrevistas com professores de três escolas de tempo integral com matrícula de estudantes do público da educação especial. Os resultados, delimitados às entrevistas com os professores do ensino comum e do AEE, sugerem que as políticas de Educação Integral e Educação Especial na perspectiva da educação inclusiva tem propósitos e finalidades congruentes, porém, na prática há ainda conflitos entre as duas políticas, que demandam redefinição do AEE.

Palavras-chave: educação especial, políticas públicas educacionais, abordagem do ciclo de políticas, atendimento educacional especializado, educação integral.

SERVICIO EDUCATIVO ESPECIALIZADO EN ESCUELAS DE TIEMPO INTEGRAL

RESUMEN: Las propuestas contemporáneas de políticas educativas inclusivas y sostenibles, como la Educación Especial desde la Perspectiva de la Educación Inclusiva y la Educación Integral de Tiempo Completo, son fundamentales para superar las desigualdades. Para los estudiantes de Educación Especial, las políticas educativas brasileñas recomiendan la prestación de Asistencia Educativa Especializada (AEE) durante el horario escolar, además de prever un aumento de la prestación de Educación a Tiempo Completo. El presente estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar cómo funciona la AEE en las escuelas de tiempo completo, dado que el estudiante debe permanecer en promedio siete horas reloj en la unidad educativa, y en consecuencia con pérdida de derechos, ya sea a la AEE o a la participación plena en actividades con sus clases. La recolección de datos involucró documentos, cuestionarios y observación sistemática y entrevistas con docentes de tres escuelas de tiempo completo con matrícula de estudiantes de educación especial. Los resultados, limitados a entrevistas con docentes de educación regular y AEE, sugieren que las políticas de Educación Integral y Educación Especial desde la perspectiva de la educación inclusiva tienen fines y objetivos congruentes, sin embargo, en la práctica aún existen conflictos entre ambas las políticas, que exigen una redefinición de la AEE.

Palabras clave: educación especial, políticas públicas educativas, enfoque del ciclo de políticas, servicio educativo especializado, educación integral.

INTRODUCTION

In Brazil, the theme Educação Integral (Integral Education) is a recurring and long-standing subject, as Anísio Teixeira, Mário de Andrade, Darcy Ribeiro and other Brazilian educators have long defended this idea in the Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education, in the mid-1930s. The New School Movement argued that schools should be spaces for the development and formation of citizenship for all, and of good quality, providing opportunities for differentiated activities throughout the school year with the purpose of promoting the integral formation of students in their pedagogical, personal, social and productive aspects. From the perspective of Integral Education, therefore, the student must be understood in his/her biopsychosocial dimension. (Castro, Lopes, 2011; Coelho, 2009; Teixeira, 1959).

However, throughout history, the debate on Integral Education has been characterized by a polysemy of concepts, perspectives and practices, from which different political and ideological strands derive, transforming the field into a territory of dispute, both in government proposals and in the reflections of researchers who dedicate themselves to studying the subject.

Coelho (2009) highlights that Integral Education presents itself both in the perspective of promoting full protection for children and adolescents and in the perspective of offering an integrated curriculum associated with the extension of the time in which the student remains in school carrying out

diverse activities, involving multiple dimensions of an individual's formation in cognitive, affective, psychomotor and social terms.

For the Ministry of Education, Integral Education is understood as:

[...] an option for an integrated educational project, in tune with the life, needs, possibilities and interests of students. It is a project in which children, adolescents and young people are seen as citizens with rights in all their dimensions. It is not just about their intellectual development, but also their physical development, taking care of their health, in addition to offering opportunities for them to have fun and produce art, learn about and value their history and cultural heritage, have a responsible attitude towards nature, learn to respect human rights and those of children and adolescents, be a creative, enterprising and participating citizen, aware of their responsibilities and rights, capable of helping the country and humanity to become increasingly equitable and supportive, to respect differences and promote peaceful and fraternal coexistence among all. (Brazil, 2015, n/p.).

Ultimately, this is a proposal that recognizes that the right to a dignified childhood experience is precarious when one's own material conditions are precarious, in terms of housing, spaces, villages, slums, streets, food, rest, or even when the conditions and family structures of care and protection become vulnerable, insecure or are inflicted by undignified forms of survival (Arroyo, 2012).

For Costa (2012), education is a fundamental element in facing the challenge of vulnerability. The autonomy and sense of responsibility that the educational process can provide to individuals and the groups to which they belong are the backbone and new system that can overcome the logic of exclusion, inequality and oppression (Moll et al., 2012).

The premise of education for all, established and guaranteed by the Federal Constitution of 1988, in article 205, has been democratizing access to school, which was previously a right of a few and select people. For Gadotti (2013), education requires investment in access conditions that enable quality sociocultural education, including transportation, health, food, clothing, culture, sports and leisure, while also considering the realities of students, promoting social inclusion and envisioning the integral quality of public schools. Integral Education is seen as “[...] a way to guarantee a quality education [...]” (Gouveia, 2006, p. 84).

For Moll (2012), increasing the school day is necessary so that students can benefit from an education that encompasses the fields of science, arts, culture and the world of work, thus having an impact on overcoming existing social inequalities reinforced by school culture. Full-time education, on the other hand, aims to increase the time spent at school and diversify educational and curricular practices to enable:

[...] fulfillment of school duties, the practice of sports, the development of artistic activities and adequate nutrition. This extension of time, still according to the Law, aims to provide significant progress in reducing social inequalities and democratically expanding learning opportunities (Zanardi, 2016, p. 84).

In this sense, the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) n° 9.394/96, in the caput of article 34, had already provided for the extension of the school day in elementary education: “The school day in elementary education will include at least four hours of effective work in the classroom, with the period of time spent at school being progressively extended [...]”. Paragraph 2 of this article states that “Elementary education will be progressively taught full-time, at the discretion of the education systems” (Brazil, 1996).

This proposal was taken up and encouraged by public education policies that encouraged the implementation of the provision of Full-Time Integral Education, through the Programa Mais Educação (More Education Program), for example (Brazil, 2010), established by Interministerial Ordinance No. 17/2007 (Brazil, 2007) as a strategy of the Ministry of Education (MEC) to encourage the construction of the Integral Education agenda in state and municipal education networks throughout the country, encouraging the extension of the school day in public schools to at least seven hours a day, through

optional activities in the following macro-fields: pedagogical monitoring, environmental education, sports and leisure, human rights in education, culture and arts, digital culture, health promotion, communication and use of media, research in the field of natural sciences, and economic education (Brazil, 2007).

Federal Decree No. 7,083 of January 27, 2010, which established the Programa Mais Educação, in Article 1, paragraph one, determined that Full-Time Basic Education is considered to be “a school day lasting seven hours or more per day during the entire school year, including the total time that a single student remains at school or in school activities” (Brazil, 2010).

Full-Time Education is also recommended in the National Education Plan (PNE), which establishes guidelines, goals and strategies for education policy between 2014 and 2024 and recommends in Goal 6: “to offer full-time education in at least 50% (fifty percent) of public schools, in order to serve at least 25% (twenty-five percent) of basic education students” (Brazil, 2014).

The National Common Curricular Base (BNCC) has as one of its pedagogical foundations the commitment to Integral Education, recognizing that Basic Education must aim at global human formation and development, understanding the complexity for development, breaking reductionist views that privilege the intellectual dimension to the detriment of others, considering everyone as subjects of learning (Brazil, 2018).

The Full-Time School Program, established by Law No. 14,640 of July 31, 2023, aims to encourage the creation of full-time enrollments in all stages and modalities of Basic Education, from the perspective of Integral Education, providing technical and financial assistance for the creation of full-time enrollments - equal to or greater than seven hours per day or 35 hours per week - considering pedagogical proposals aligned with the National Common Curricular Base, by expanding the time period from the perspective of integral education and prioritizing schools that serve students in situations of greater socioeconomic vulnerability (Brazil, 2023).

The focus of this education model is the development of the student, who must have their characteristics, desires and skills recognized and developed as a way to prepare them for life (Gomes; Azevedo, 2020). Thus, Integral Education is a concept of education that aims at the integral formation of individuals in all their aspects and dimensions (cognitive, physical, social, cultural, affective and intellectual), while full-time education refers to the extension of the student's school day and permanence (Gomes-Silva, 2022).

Regarding principles and purposes, Integral Education and the Special Education modality are similar in the purpose of the integral development and formation of infants, children, adolescents and young people based on an intentional curriculum that expands and articulates different educational, social, scientific, environmental, cultural and sports experiences in spaces inside and outside the school, with the participation of the school community as integral subjects, respecting, valuing and meeting the specificities of the students. Considering that students in the Special Education program are part of the minority and vulnerable school population, they can and should benefit from Integral Education programs in Full-Time Schools.

Special Education is the type of school education offered preferably in the regular school system, for students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities or giftedness.

In 2008, the Ministry of Education enacted the National Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education, which ensures full participation and the right to learning from the perspective of non-discrimination. The policy guideline is that the public of the Special Education program (PAEE) be enrolled in the regular class, but with the guarantee of the provision of Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) in the opposite shift of the student's attendance in the regular class, both to meet their specific needs and to guarantee full participation in the regular class.

Therefore, Brazilian educational policies recommend that Special Education students receive Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) in Multifunctional Resource Rooms outside of school hours. The AEE would have the following functions: to identify, develop and organize pedagogical and accessibility resources that eliminate barriers to the full participation of students with specific educational needs and ensure conditions of access to the curriculum by promoting accessibility to teaching materials, spaces and equipment, communication and information systems and all school activities (Brazil, 2008).

The National Education Plan (PNE) (Brazil, 2014) provides for both universal access to AEE for students in Special Education, in its goal 4, and the gradual increase in the provision of full-time education for all students, in goal 6. However, both goals of this educational policy contrast in their guidelines insofar as the policies that provide for Special Education also provide for the implementation of AEE in the after-school period (Brazil, 2011), while Law No. 14,640 of July 31, 2023 (Brazil, 2023), encourages the creation of full-time enrollments in all stages and modalities of Basic Education, from the perspective of full-time school, which, consequently, would make AEE in the after-school period unfeasible.

Mendes, Vilaronga and Zerbato (2014) believe that there is too much investment in AEE aimed at students, with very limited guidelines regarding joint activities between specialized teachers and regular education teachers, such as supporting the pedagogical process of students in the context of the regular classroom. The fact that teachers work in different shifts prevents the necessary coordination, so that these students generally experience separate schooling processes: one in the regular classroom and the other in the SRM. Thus, since specialized teachers dedicate a large part of their workdays to directly assist students in the after-school period, they hardly have the space and time to coordinate with regular classroom teachers from different school shifts, and the necessary collaborative work between teachers is hindered. In the document “Guide for the allocation and distribution of full-time enrollments with efficiency and equity”, we find what the Ministry of Education recommends for students in Special Education:

Regarding the allocation of full-time enrollments, it is recommended that Specialized Educational Assistance, the necessary resources and support professionals, based on a pedagogical evaluation be offered, as provided for in Technical Note MEC/Secadi/DPPE No. 4, of 2014. The provision of full-time integral education for PAEE must consider, whenever applicable, the demand for student assistance in the intersectoral assistance and care network. In terms of stage, it is suggested that early childhood education, seeking integral development in early childhood and its positive effects for the continuation of schooling be prioritized, as well as in the final years of elementary school and high school, promoting school retention, completion of compulsory basic education and mitigating school dropout and evasion (BRASIL, 2023, p.6).

The recommendation is that the provision of Specialized Educational Services, as well as the necessary resources and support professionals, be defined based on a pedagogical assessment, as provided for in Technical Note MEC/Secadi/DPPE No. 4, 2014. However, the note deals with the supporting documents for students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities or giftedness in the School Census, which is the Specialized Educational Services Plan – PAEE, a document in which the school, institutionally, recognizes the enrollment of the public student in special education and ensures that their educational specificities are met. However, the note does not contain any guidance on when and where the student will receive the AEE, if their school is full-time, therefore not allowing for the possibility of after-school classes.

The note specifies that it is up to the AEE teacher to prepare the Specialized Educational Service Plan – PAEE, but that its implementation must be carried out by teachers who work in the Multifunctional Resource Room (SRM) or AEE Center (CAEE), in conjunction with other regular education teachers, with the participation of families, and in conjunction with other sectoral health and social assistance services, among others, when necessary.

In this regard, it is worth highlighting the possibility that students from the Special Education public may also receive AEE in SRMs of other schools, or in CAEE, therefore outside their school of origin, which makes coordination between schools or school and CAEE difficult. There are also some cases of students in this group who need systematic care from the health and rehabilitation sector. And in both cases, if this school is full-time, receiving AEE or requiring additional sectoral care will mean no longer having full participation in the regular class.

Finally, what should be prioritized: Special Education and/or Additional Services, or even full participation in the activities of the class in full-time school? If the priority is to meet the specific needs of the student, ensuring Special Education and/or Additional Services, who decides when the

student will be removed from the class and how is this done? There is no guidance in the official documents regarding this issue for the education networks.

Another important point to consider is the issue of financing, since Law No. 14,133/2020, which provides for the distribution of resources from the Basic Education Maintenance and Development Fund (Fundeb), recognizes that Special Education brings specific requirements that increase its costs, and therefore establishes some specific rules for students in the Special Education category. Thus, the enrollment of a student in the Special Education Modality has a weighting factor of 1.40 (one whole and forty hundredths) for calculation purposes. Furthermore, there is the admission of double counting of enrollment, if the public Special Education student is enrolled and attending a regular class while also in the AEE in the opposite shift (Brazil, 2011).

Therefore, in the case of full-time schools, the double calculation of the enrollment of students who are part the Special Education public may be compromised if there is no enrollment in the AEE and in the regular class; and in the absence of guidelines, this may favor arbitrary decisions to ensure the AEE, removing students from the Full-Time Education activities in order to maintain funding. Another possibility, which does not take into account the needs of the student, but rather the conveniences of the network, is to prioritize full participation in the class activities and fail to ensure the AEE when the school lacks, for example, teachers and/or the physical space for the implementation of the SRM and/or lack of CAEE in the location.

It is important to know how the two policies, the Special Education Policy from the perspective of Inclusive Education and the Integral Education Policy in Full-Time Schools, intersect, since according to the 2022 school census, regarding the enrollment of students from the Special Education public, one third of them were in full-time schools, and 47% of the total number of students had access to AEE (Brasil-INEP, 2023). Also noteworthy is the indicator of access to AEE which fell by 2.7% from 2013 to 2023.

Therefore, considering that public education policies demand increasing adherence to the provision of Integral Education, is it necessary to determine how to ensure AEE in Full-Time Schools? And, considering the two aforementioned policies that are in progress, it remains to be seen how, in the context of practice, that is, within the scope of schools, the confluence between AEE has occurred for students served in full-time schools.

This study was conducted at a Regional Education Directorate (DRE) in the municipal education network of São Paulo, which presented guidelines for AEE to students in the Special Education public enrolled in full-time schools, standardized by the São Paulo Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PPEE-EI). In the city of São Paulo, in 2021, the public education network had approximately 200 schools² that joined the São Paulo Integral (SPI) program, out of approximately 1,800³, that is, only 11% of schools, far from the 50% target established in the PNE. In 2021, 31,692 students benefited from the SPI program, in a network with more than 880 thousand students⁴, still far from the target established in the PNE, which is expected to serve at least 25% of full-time students.

In its art. 23, paragraph four, the PPEE-EI states that students enrolled in the São Paulo Integral Program (SPI) should not benefit from the AEE in the after-school program due to the time spent at school (on average, seven hours), unless there is no other way to provide assistance (São Paulo, 2016).

In order to resolve the conflict between policies, the PPEE-EI (São Paulo, 2016) defines another possibility, the Collaborative AEE, developed during the school shift, articulated with teachers from all areas of knowledge, in all educational times and spaces, ensuring that the specific needs of each

² As published in SME-SP Announcement No. 470 with the list of educational units that joined the São Paulo Integral/2021 Program, published in the city's official gazette on 10/14/2020.

³ Only teaching modalities that fit the SPI Program membership profile available on the website <http://eolgerenciamento.prefeitura.sp.gov.br/frmgerencial/NumerosCoordenadoria.aspx?Cod=000000> (Accessed on 07/14/2021 at 11:49 pm) were considered.

⁴ The number considers only students enrolled in the direct education network, found on the website: <http://eolgerenciamento.prefeitura.sp.gov.br/frmgerencial/NumerosCoordenadoria.aspx?Cod=000000> (Accessed on July 14, 2021 at 11:49 pm).

student are met, as expressed in the PAEE, through systematic monitoring by the AEE Teacher (São Paulo, 2016).

Ball and Mainardes (2011) emphasize that public education policies are designed for environments with the appropriate infrastructure and working conditions, without considering the differences in local contexts, regional inequalities, resources and/or local capacities, especially in a country as large and unequal as Brazil. In the Theory of Enactment, Stephen Ball (1994) emphasizes that policies are not simply implemented, but, in schools, are interpreted and enacted by actors, who are subject to different contextual dimensions. Thus, the objective of this study was to describe and analyze the AEE in a specific DRE of the municipal education network of São Paulo, in the context of three full-time schools.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The first stage of the research involved requesting authorization from the São Paulo Municipal Education Department (SME-SP). After authorization was given, a request was made to the regional education board of the selected region. The ethical procedures of the research were followed in compliance with Resolution No. 466/2012 and Resolution No. 510 of April 7, 2016 of the National Health Council. Therefore, the research project was submitted and approved by the Research Ethics Committee - CEP of the Federal University of São Carlos - UFSCar under CAAE No. 39863920.0.0000.5504, on February 5, 2021, under opinion No. 4,526,142.

In the second stage, a documentary study was carried out, where the documents of the national and municipal Special Education policy were compared in order to analyze the context of the policy texts.

In the third stage, an online survey was conducted using a semi-structured questionnaire with open and closed questions, which was answered by 29 educators, including 21 regular classroom teachers, two special education teachers, four pedagogical coordinators, and two principals or assistant principals.

In the fourth stage, a descriptive study was conducted in three schools, which involved observation sessions and interviews with professionals from three schools, to better understand how educational policies, which are not simply implemented in a linear manner as recommended by the documents, are actively interpreted and shaped by the various actors involved in the educational process in their various local contexts. It is worth noting that, due to the need for delimitation, it is the data from this stage that will be described as results in this study, although based on the results of the other stages.

The study took place in three municipal elementary schools (EMEF), selected because they have enrollment of students from the Special Education population and because they offer full-time education. The schools were selected because they presented three different realities: E1 had an SRM, but no AEE teacher; E2 had an SRM and an AEE teacher; and E3 did not have an SRM, but had an Itinerant AEE teacher. Chart 1 describes the characteristics of the three schools.

In terms of enrollment, infrastructure, and teaching staff, it can be seen that E1 was the largest school and E3 the smallest, although the former had the lowest proportion of students from the Special Education population (2.3%) and E3 the largest proportion (3.45%), and only E3 did not have an SRM.

Chart 1 - School Contexts

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS	SCHOOL 1	SCHOOL 2	SCHOOL 3
Registration	769	656	349
EPAEE	18 (2.3%)	20 (3%)	12 (3.45)
SRM	NO	YES	NO
Structure	reading room, computer lab, playground, internet access, covered patio, outdoor court, vegetable garden, experimental kitchen, radio, "aquarium" room (instruments, costumes, dressing room), elevator, adapted bathroom	reading room, computer lab, playground, internet access, covered patio, covered court, vegetable garden, adapted park, cafeteria	reading room, computer lab, playground, internet access, covered and uncovered patio, covered and uncovered court, playroom, adapted bathroom
Teachers	38	33	27
Technologies	Multimedia kits in classrooms	Projectors Notebooks	Notebooks
Staff	School agent, Assistant Director, Technical Education Assistant, Pedagogical Coordinator, Director, Teachers, Secretary	School Agent, Assistant Director, Technical Education Assistant, Pedagogical Coordinator, Director, Teachers, AEE Teacher, Secretary	School Agent, Assistant Director, Technical Education Assistant, Pedagogical Coordinator, Director, Teachers, Secretary
Support team	Support Agent, School Life Assistant, Interns	Support Agent, School Life Assistant, Interns	Support Agent, School Life Assistant, Interns
IDEB (Basic Education Development Index))	Initial years - 5.1 Final years - *	Initial years – 6.3 Final years – 5.3	Initial years – 6.5 Final years – 5.5

Source: Research Data. By the authors.

Chart 2 describes the characteristics of the Special Education teachers, and Table 1 describes the regular education teachers in each school and the number of Special Education students in their classes. To maintain anonymity, the participating teachers were given fictitious names that pay homage to countries on the African continent.

The two Special Education teachers were women, ages between 35 and 45 years, with between six (E3) and seven (E2) years of experience in Special Education, and who had a specialization course in the area of Special Education. Angola worked in E2, both in the collaborative and after-school AEE modality, and served 20 students. Argelia worked in E3, in the Itinerant and Collaborative AEE

modalities, and served 154 students from several schools, which indicates that the working conditions are complex for teachers who work on an itinerant basis.

Chart 2 – Characterization information of Pr-AEE (AEE Teachers)

Participant	Training	Specialization	Time of activity	AEE Modality	EPAAEE Quantity
Angola (E2)	Arts and Pedagogy	Special Education	7 years	Collaborative and After-School	20
Argelia (E3)	Mathematics	Special Education with emphasis on Multiple Disabilities and Special Education with emphasis on high abilities/giftedness	6 years	Itinerant and Collaborative	154

Source: Research Data. By the authors.

Table 1 - Number of EPAAEE attended by each teacher

E1	N	E2	N	E3	N
1. Argel	6	8. Eritreia	4	16. Benim	2
2. Harare	2	9. Líbia	5	17. Chade	15
3. Luanda	0	10. Malawi	4	18. Liberia	6
4. Lusaka	13	11. Somalia	6	19. Nairobi	16
5. Namibia	5	12. Tunisia	5	20. Kenya	2
6. Niger	3	13. Uganda	1	21. Rwanda	1
7. Nigeria	13	14. Zambia	4		
		15. Zimbabwe	1		

Source: Research Data. By the authors.

Of the three schools, seven teachers from E1, eight from E2 and six from E3 participated. The number of Special Education students reported by them ranged from zero (Luanda-E1) to 16 (Nairobi-E3). Interestingly, in E2, where there was a SRM and an AEE teacher, this number was lower, ranging from one (Zimbabwe and Uganda) to a maximum of six students (Somalia), which indicates differences in the criteria for distributing students in classes at schools and between schools.

The analysis procedure involved triangulating data from different sources. However, for this study, priority was given to the reports obtained in interviews with teachers, collected in the fourth stage, related to the study in schools, given that these were the results that best responded to the objective of describing and analyzing the provision of AEE in full-time schools. To this end, the teachers' statements in the interviews were transcribed, the content was analyzed and categorized, and the results presented reflect the main conclusions with excerpts from the statements to illustrate and support the interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to describe and analyze how the AEE was implemented in full-time schools in the municipal network, we specifically prioritized the reports collected in interviews with regular education and AEE teachers from the three schools investigated. The results highlighted here were organized into four categories of analysis, namely: a) teachers' perceptions about Integral Education; b) teachers'

perceptions about the Relationship between Integral Education and Inclusive Education; c) conceptions about Collaborative AEE in full-time schools; d) possibilities of Collaborative AERE in full-time schools; and e) perceptions of regular education teachers about Collaborative AEE in full-time schools.

Integral Education

Integral education considers the school as an institution that offers protection against the brutal violence of the urban context, as a space for the formation of a complete human being capable of understanding and fighting against the social inequalities imposed on their daily lives, and as a promoter of an education that prioritizes the development of all, regardless of their specific educational needs (Arroyo, 2012).

In the three units investigated, there was a perception that the school was not only built inside the school building, but considered the territory as part of the student's educational process and the school as the most democratic space we have today in our society, as illustrated by the following report:

“I believe that spaces complement each other. Including those outside the school walls, on school grounds” (Teacher Eritrea - E2).

“In integral education, any space can become educational” (Teacher Nigeria - E1).

Therefore, it is important that teachers who work with the perspective of integral student education understand that educational spaces are not limited to the school walls. The surrounding community, with its resources and practices, also contributes significantly to everyone's learning (Giroux, 2004), just as all the equipment that is located around the school is part of an educational territory for students. It is important to consider that the school is not the only educational institution in our society. “The world, with its multiple dimensions, offers a series of contexts and situations that also educate” (Freire, 1996).

Relationship between Integral Education and Inclusive Education

However, integral education presupposes that all spaces, both inside and outside the school, have educational potential. Learning is a continuous process that occurs in different contexts (Morin, 2000) and is aligned with the vision that the school should be an inclusive and welcoming space, where differences are celebrated, and everyone has the opportunity to learn and grow. The school is the most democratic place in our society; however, education should not be a privilege for a few, but a right for everyone. The school should be a space where all differences are respected and valued (Teixeira, 1961).

In the view of the participants, a close relationship between Integral Education and inclusive Special Education was evident, as illustrated by the reports below:

“Despite all the setbacks and difficulties faced in the unit, the school is still an inclusive and welcoming place for differences” (Teacher Nigeria - E1).

“The way the projects and themes developed within our unit are organized, I think the possibilities for Inclusive Special Education are endless” (Teacher Eritrea - E2).

In summary, most teachers stated that they were aware of the São Paulo Special Education Policy from the Perspective of Inclusive Education. Teachers tended to view the idea of school inclusion favorably. However, it is important to consider that “policy is easy, actions are not” (Ball et al, 2016, p. 22). Knowing the policy in order to put it into practice is essential, but the way in which it should be implemented, that is, the guidelines of a public policy, as well as its explanation for everyone's knowledge, is essential.

Concepts about Collaborative AEE in full-time schools

When it comes to defining support for the schooling of students from the Special Education public in regular schools, both the national Special Education Policy from the Perspective of Inclusive

Education (Brazil, 2008) and the municipal policy prioritize compensatory mechanisms, such as AEE in the after-school period associated with attendance in regular classes.

However, the study showed that, in practice, there were three distinct realities in the same regional school board. One of the schools had an educational support teacher, the second had an itinerant special education teacher, and the third had no specialized teacher at the time of the study. These different realities show the importance of the schools' material contexts (Ball; Maguire; Braun, 2016).

In the teachers' reports, more than in the observations of the schools, it was possible to identify some promising paths in the RME-SP, all pointing to "collaborative AEE", predominant in the practice of special education from an inclusive perspective in full-time schools, due to the guidelines of the municipal policy. The teachers explained how this Collaborative AEE practice occurs in everyday life: and for this reason, they were prioritized in the description of the results.

The collaborative AEE is carried out in partnership with the pedagogical coordinator and the Regular Education teacher, in support of planning of accessible classes and activities, considering the principles of the UDL (Universal Design for Learning); guidelines for the development and construction of accessible teaching materials; guidelines for the use of AT (Assistive Technologies) and accessibility in IT; training meetings with the entire group of teachers of each S.U (school unit), to discuss and reflect on the issues related to students in the target audience of Special Education (Teacher-AEE Argelia - E3).

We are working with collaborative teaching in an increasing and positive way, a school is formed by many professionals who need to adapt to new information so that we can structure this teaching that until now was not part of the AEE; therefore I affirm that collaborative teaching is included in our practices and that we are working so that it is reaffirmed every day (Pr-AEE Angola - E2).

The political performance of special education teachers in full-time school contexts possibly differs from that of traditional schools (Ball et al., 2012). Thus, in full-time schools, due to the impediment in offering after-school services due to the extended time spent in the school, although all teachers refer to collaborative AEE, in line with what is recommended in the São Paulo policy guidelines, different understandings of AEE emerged among the teachers, as illustrated in the excerpts below:

I strive to assist teachers through the Collaborative AEE, in partnership, guiding what can be done in the regular classroom so that everyone can participate. However, the SRM is always open to meeting the needs of students, as they arise, and there is always someone who needs more systematic monitoring. In these cases, there is specific assistance based on the immediate need for intervention with the student in the SRM (Teacher -AEE Angola - E2).

In full-time schools, these activities (specific to the AEE) are developed in the context of the regular classroom, so that the student is not separated from regular teaching activities. The partnership between the AEE teacher and regular teaching is enriching in that it plans more accessible classes, especially if the principles of Universal Design for Learning are considered (Teacher -AEE Argelia - E3).

The SRM in the reality of full-time and integral education is integrated into the dynamics of the school in a natural way, it becomes a space of construction that is used by everyone, without labels, without rules, just as a space of diversity for the development of projects and classes within the routine of everyone who wants to use it [...] In the full-time school the student has projects, dynamics and diverse spaces, their time within the school is extended; therefore, with collaborative care we understand that they can expand skills and overcome difficulties that may exist with adequate guidance and support (Teacher -AEE Angola - E2).

In the excerpts mentioned above, we can see different conceptions of what collaborative AEE should be like in a full-time school, which are possibly dictated by the material conditions of the schools, considering that E2 had SRM and E3 did not. The first excerpt, from Angola - E2, indicates a view that it is necessary to prioritize collaborative AEE in the regular classroom (Teacher -AEE Angola - E2), associating, if necessary, the AEE directed towards the student in the SRM. In this case, the student's participation in the activities with the class is not full, because he or she can be removed to

receive AEE in the context of the resource rooms, and this involves decisions about the moments in which the student will stop participating in the collective activities of his or her class. Regarding the understanding of the function of SRM in a full-time school, the comment made by Angola, who worked in E2, that had SRM, shows the idea that it is a structure intended to serve students from the Special Education population, as a resource that can be used for the entire school.

Unlike Angola's conception, that collaborative AEE should be carried out primarily in the context of the regular classroom, though not exclusively, there is the interpretation of Teacher-AEE Argelia (E3), who understands that collaborative AEE in full-time schools should occur exclusively in the regular classroom, remembering that E3 did not have SRM.

And although both teachers emphasize that collaborative AEE in the regular classroom should aim to improve the quality of teaching for all students, and not exclusively students from the Special Education audience, the understandings about what the role of the specialized teacher should be varies from the idea that he or she should “guide” the work of the regular education teacher (Teacher - AEE Angola) to a vision that does not presuppose hierarchy, but rather partnership with equity, and that both should work collaboratively (Teacher-AEE Argelia - E3) to meet the principles of Universal Design for Learning, which implies diversifying teaching to contemplate the diversity of the group of students.

Possibilities of Collaborative AEE in full-time schools

When asked about the possibilities and challenges of collaborative AEE in their respective schools, the specialized teachers responded:

“Establishing collaborative work provided a major step forward in terms of giving greater visibility to the work of the AEE teacher and making their actions more effective in supporting the regular education teacher and, consequently, the student’s development” (Pr-AEE Angola - E2).

Thus, Collaborative AEE changed the perspective of teaching, as teachers were able to perceive and identify students' potential, making classes more accessible in order to provide access to the curriculum, which reflects on the quality of teaching for students in Special Education. In addition, teachers reported that the Collaborative AEE gave more visibility to the work of specialized teachers than the work in the AEE in SRM directed towards the student.

Reiterating what the literature in the area points out, there is also evidence that collaborative AEE enables opportunities for continued training arising from the partnership between regular and specialized education teachers, and provides greater autonomy to regular education teachers. In addition, it strengthened the culture of collaboration with the pedagogical coordination. The AEE teacher Angola reinforced the partnership with the pedagogical coordination of her school:

“Working with pedagogical coordination is essential, productive and effective. Over time, we have developed a relationship of trust and support for the development of AEE within our school. The space is democratic and open to everyone’s growth” (Teacher -AEE Angola - E2).

The excerpt from the response prepared by Teacher Angola is consistent with the concept defended by Capellini and Zerbato (2019), who state that it is essential for the management team to encourage teachers to work collaboratively, believing that this is another way to contribute to the success of the schooling of students in the Special Education public sector as well as the Special Education policy from the perspective of Inclusive Education. A collaborative culture occurs in the long term and is determined by all actors involved in the educational process. Angola highlights that working in partnership with the school team, based on the concept of Collaborative AEE, has contributed to improving the practice and offer of teaching in the school environment. This is a practice that has been consolidating as a service to support the schooling of students in the special education public sector.

Perceptions of regular education teachers about Collaborative AEE in full-time schools.

When asked about the support provided by the AEE teacher at school and in common educational spaces and about working in partnership, regular schoolteachers generally highlighted very positive aspects, as can be seen in the reports below:

“The AEE teacher at the unit is very collaborative. She is always willing to help with the students’ AEE plans, as well as giving tips on how to meet the specific needs of each student” (Teacher Zimbabwe - E2).

“There is a lot of partnership. I always turn to the professional if I have any questions or want to make any observations that I consider relevant regarding the development of a public special education student” (Teacher Eritrea - E2).

“In addition to training, the AEE teacher is always available to help us plan, adapt activities or to give ideas or answer questions [...] she is always available for planning, adapting activities, training, working with parents and protection networks, among other things” (Teacher Uganda - E2).

Here, at our school, the collaboration helped a lot, because we learned to move forward with more autonomy; there are things about adapting and adjusting activities that I no longer need to go to Angola for, I learned how to do them. And she also taught us that all students should be treated equally, so what I offer to student J. is what is offered to the rest of the class. He is never separated -of course, respecting his specificities (Teacher Eritrea – E2).

According to the reports of the head teachers, there was a partnership with the AEE teacher, but the partnership was not always collaborative, as recommended in the literature, which presupposes, among other things, that both teachers work towards common goals, with parity and voluntarism (Mendes et al., 2014; Capellini, Zerbato, 2019). Thus, the work of guiding one teacher over another, for example, is a breach in the principle of parity because the relationship becomes hierarchical. On the other hand, adapting or producing material can also violate the principle of parity because the AEE teacher puts him/herself at the service of the head teacher, who is sovereign in defining what and how to teach, without necessarily having a partnership in carrying out the planning and evaluation process of the class.

However, it is important to recognize that the common goals of providing access to the curriculum and the desire to establish a partnership are present, and the teachers recognize that this is a proposal under construction. For Oliveira and Prieto (2020, p. 348), “there is a need for a study that explores the feasibility of actions in AEE based on the narrative of the teacher who works in these spaces”.

Despite the challenges, collaborative AEE, in the opinion of the teachers, had an impact on the development of students in regular classes, removing the specialized teacher from invisibility and from working exclusively in the after-school hours of students in special education, and this possibly happens because the role of the specialized teacher changes.

However, regular education teachers report that Collaborative AEE, when carried out in the itinerant model, that is, when the specialized teacher serves several schools, reduces the possibilities of partnership with regular education teachers; thus they recommend the need for a greater number of specialized teachers, or that the specialized teacher be assigned to a single school.

“Unfortunately, the AEE teacher has several schools and students, which sometimes makes the process difficult, since the network does not have more professionals, which would possibly reduce the demand, making it possible for a greater integration between the AEE teacher and the school” (Teacher Nigeria - E1).

It is worth remembering that Argelia, an AEE teacher for E3, worked in Itinerant AEE and Collaborative AEE, and was in charge of a total of 154 students from the Special Education population, which justifies Nigeria's statement.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Public policies for Special Education and Integral Education strongly demand the support of education networks, and it is important to raise the need to review the conflicting guidelines and policies of the Ministry of Education, which currently presents barriers to guaranteeing the right to education for students in the Special Education population. It is also worth noting that the problem tends to worsen as more students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities/giftedness are enrolled in extended-day schools, remaining in schools for seven hours, and are not guaranteed the right to AEE, when after-school activities are not possible.

This study focused precisely on understanding the effectiveness of schooling for students in the Special Education population in Integral and Full-Time Education schools. The network studied proposed an alternative solution to AEE in the after-school period, which did not imply the exclusion of the possibility of the student's full participation in activities with their class: Collaborative AEE. Thus, although the Ministry of Education does not offer guidelines for a Special Education policy that is adapted to the new times, insisting on a model of support for after-school special education that has already shown its insufficiency in local contexts, the education systems are demonstrating they are more progressive, developing their own policies and taking a leading role in better balancing the confluence between the two policies and thus ensuring the rights of students. It is worth noting that the lack of solutions for the conflict between the two policies, on the part of the Ministry of Education, opens a space for increasing educational inequalities, as the education systems can develop different paths which do not always ensure the rights of students.

However, even though the education network in question has a political response to the problem of contradiction between Special Education and Integral Education policies, this apparently does not mean that, in the context of schools, the right to AEE is guaranteed, since different realities were found, with one school that did not have an AEE teacher and/or SRM, another that had an itinerant AEE teacher but did not have SRM, and a third school with both resources. The fact is that the presence of the specialized teacher was decisive in making collaborative AEE viable, regardless of whether there was a physical space for resource rooms, and even if the teacher worked in the itinerant model.

The regular education teachers pointed out the importance of the AEE teacher's work in the educational units and how much the partnership, established in the guidelines, in the specialized educational services, in the elaboration of individualized educational plans, and in the evaluation, contributes to a more attentive look at the regular classroom and for the more qualified service of the students in the classroom. In the schools in which there was no specialized professional working directly, teachers complained about the absence of this professional for specific and assertive guidance and more qualified services, and to ensure accessibility to the curriculum and educational practices.

It was also found that, in the three schools, the perceptions of teachers, based on the policies and their performances, within the possibilities that were offered to them, aimed to improve the quality of education for all. In the school where there was an SRM, the AEE went beyond the "specific" space of the SRM, which could occur in all school spaces, and the SRM became another piece of school equipment available to everyone.

It was also possible to identify that teachers from full-time schools defended the perspective of Collaborative AEE, which consists of a partnership between a special education teacher and a regular education teacher, developed during the shift, at all times and educational spaces, ensuring that the specific needs of each student are met. It was possible to identify that, where there was an AEE teacher, there were exchanges between both teachers, aiming at the planning, execution and evaluation of activities in the context of the regular classroom. In this sense, the performance of the collaborative AEE teachers seems to move in the direction of what the literature presents, in a similar way to the definition of Collaborative Teaching and/or Co-teaching, but it is still necessary to deepen how this occurs in practice, and how training programs should reverse the logic of training teachers to deal directly with students, to the possibility of collaboration with other educators in the school.

At present, it is clear that, in the context of schools, the educational policies, in their different spheres still do not indicate the guidelines for carrying out the work of teaching, giving rise to different interpretations and actions related to these policies. The results found corroborate the evidence produced by the literature which indicates that the provision of support from specialized teachers in the context of

the regular classroom is promising; in the case of this study, carried out through the Collaborative AEE, a modality established in public education policy by the municipal education network of São Paulo. However, training programs for teaching teams seem necessary to clarify the partnership between regular education teachers and specialized teachers.

The literature suggests paths based on co-teaching and/or collaborative teaching, but the study showed that collaborative AEE and collaborative teaching are not synonymous, despite having the same premise, which is the partnership between specialized teachers and regular classroom teachers to support the accessibility⁵ of special education students to regular education, considering the student's potential in terms of their development and considering their integrality in all dimensions: intellectual, physical, emotional and affective, social and cultural.

Action from the perspective of collaborative AEE in regular classrooms is generally effective to ensure that the student has access to the standard curriculum, to promote ongoing training for all involved and to foster a collaborative culture. However, it is necessary to provide time and space for joint planning, implementation and evaluation by regular classroom teachers and specialized teachers, in addition to providing for a systematization of the recording of this practice.

In the reality observed, it is possible to identify that there are still remnants of the specialized teacher acting as an expert who will guide, or as an assistant who will adapt materials and activities for the head teacher. Most of the teaching work of the specialized teacher is still focused on the Special Education student, when it should be focused on expanding the teachers' capacity to respond to the diversity of students. However, the discrepancy observed between what is recommended in the literature and the São Paulo model is possibly still the result of conflicts between the policies of the different federated entities, the lack of more specific political guidelines on Collaborative AEE, as well as the lack of systematic in-service training.

The conclusion is that Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education and Integral Education are fundamental educational concepts for overcoming inequalities and begin with aspects such as equity, inclusion, equalization, accessibility, participation and learning for all students. Both concepts are similar and/or complement each other, as they consider the entirety of the subjects involved in the teaching-learning process, in order to consider and value their potential, placing the student at the center, as the main protagonist, in this educational process.

An urgent point is the need to redefine the concept of AEE in the after-school period, of the schooling period of the student in the regular classroom, to expand it to other service models, which also involves the support of the AEE teacher in the context of the regular classroom, or even itinerant ones. In this sense, what the evidence suggests is that, in addition to expanding the concept of AEE in order to consider other models in the list of possibilities, intra-class support, rather than extra-class support, should be the model prioritized in the guidelines of Special Education policies from the Perspective of Inclusive Education, if the intention of expanding the proportion of Integral Education in full-time schools continues. The need to guarantee several AEE models in the policy is important to meet the different realities of the more than 180 thousand Brazilian schools, for which the one-size-fits-all AEE has proven to be limited.

In addition to considering the AEE model, it is also necessary to investigate the impact of issues related to financing, since currently, if students attend regular classes and AEE in the SRM, the network is entitled to double Fundeb funding. However, this does not happen if the student is in a full-time school that offers AEE in the collaborative model. In this case, administrators may choose not to place students from the Special Education population in full-time schools so as not to lose resources, or, on the contrary, to place these students in full-time schools to avoid hiring specialized teachers or having to create a physical space for the SRM. Both possibilities imply opening space for the widening of inequalities caused by the central government's educational policy.

⁵ In the original work, the author uses the term "Accessibilization", with the sense of "accessing, entering, reaching something that is accessible, that can be understood and, above all, that makes sense and is also legitimized by others. It is the process of appropriation of oneself added to the legitimization of one's existence by others". (Ebersold, 2021; Gomes-Silva, Romano, Cabral, 2023)

In addition to the AEE and financing, it will also be necessary to investigate what the impact of the increase in school time and the consequent need to increase the cost of support services for school personnel, such as support professionals, interpreters, interpreter guides, etc. will be. And how school attendance will be balanced with other extra-school support that some students require, such as medical care and/or rehabilitation services. In these cases, regulations on individualized educational planning (PEI), which do not exist, will be necessary to define, in collegiate decisions, what is best for each individual case.

Finally, this study, when investigating the AEE in three full-time schools, showed that Integral and Inclusive Education policies and plans exist, but they may not withstand a more detailed examination when it comes to guaranteeing the basic rights of access, participation, permanence and learning of students from the Special Education population in the regular classes of regular schools. Many points are still undefined in the guidelines of the two policies and need to be better addressed.

REFERENCES

ARROYO, Miguel Gonzáles. O direito a tempos-espacos de um justo e digno viver. In: MOLL, Jaqueline (Org.). *Caminhos da Educação Integral no Brasil: direito a outros tempos e espaços educativos*. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2012, p. 33-45.

BALL, Stephen John. Sociologias das políticas educacionais e pesquisa crítico-social: uma revisão pessoal das políticas educacionais e da pesquisa em política educacional. In: BALL, Stephen John; MAINARDES, Jefferson. *Políticas Educacionais: questões e dilemas*. 1. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011, p. 21-53.

BALL, Stephen John; MAGUIRE Meg; BRAUN, Annette. *How Schools do Policy: policy enactment in secondary schools*. London: Routledge New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2012.

BALL, Stephen John; MAGUIRE Meg; BRAUN, Annette. *Como as escolas fazem as políticas: atuação em escolas secundárias*. 23 ed. Ponta Grossa: UEPG, 2016.

BRASIL. *Lei n.9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, 1996.

BRASIL. *Portaria Normativa Interministerial n.º 17, de 24 de abril de 2007*. Diário Oficial da União de 27 de abril de 2007. Institui o Programa Mais Educação, que visa fomentar a educação integral de crianças, adolescentes e jovens, por meio do apoio a atividades socioeducativas no contraturno escolar. Ministério da Educação. Brasília, 2007.

BRASIL. *Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*. Documento elaborado pelo Grupo de Trabalho nomeado pela Portaria Ministerial nº 555, de 5 de junho de 2007, prorrogada pela Portaria nº 948, entregue ao Ministério da Educação em 07 de janeiro de 2008. Secretaria de Educação Especial (SEESP). Brasília: MEC/SEESP, 2008.

BRASIL. *Decreto nº 7.083, de 27 de janeiro de 2010*. Dispõe sobre o Programa Mais Educação. CNE/CEB. Brasília, 2010.

BRASIL. *Decreto nº 7.611, de 17 de novembro de 2011*. Dispõe sobre a Educação especial, o Atendimento Educacional Especializado e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União, 18 de novembro de 2011. Brasília, 2011.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014*. A Presidência da República aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação (PNE) (2014–2024) e dá outras providências. Brasília, 2014.

BRASIL. *Educação Integral/Educação Integrada e(m) tempo integral: concepções e práticas na educação brasileira - Mapeamento das experiências de jornada escolar ampliada no Brasil: estudo qualitativo*. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Básica. Brasília, 256 p. Série Mais Educação. 2015.

BRASIL. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Ministério da Educação. Brasília, 2018.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 14.640 de 31 de julho de 2023*. Institui o Programa Escola em Tempo Integral; e altera a Lei nº 11.273 de 6 de fevereiro de 2006, a Lei nº 13.415 de 16 de fevereiro de 2017 e a Lei nº 14.172 de 10 de junho de 2021. Brasília, 2023.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep). *Censo da Educação Básica 2022: notas estatísticas*. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2023.

CAPELLINI, Vera Lúcia Messias Fialho; ZERBATO, Ana Paula. *O que é o ensino colaborativo?* 1ª ed. São Paulo: Edicon, 2019.

CASTRO, Adriana de; LOPES, Roseli Esquerdo. A escola de tempo integral: desafios e possibilidades. Ensaio: avaliação de políticas públicas educacionais. [s.n]. Rio de Janeiro. v. 19, n. 71, p. 259-282, 2011. <<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362011000300003>>

COELHO, Lígia Martha C. da Costa. História(s) da educação integral. *Revista Em Aberto*, Brasília. v. 22, n. 80, p. 83-96. 2009. <<https://doi.org/10.24109/2176-6673.emaberto.21i80.2222>>

COSTA, Natacha. G. da. Comunidades educativas: por uma educação para o desenvolvimento integral. In: MOLL, Jaqueline (Coord.). *Caminhos da Educação Integral no Brasil: direito a outros tempos e espaços educativos*. Porto Alegre: Penso. 2012. p. 477-483.

EBERSOLD, S. The Grammar of Accessibility. In *Accessibility or Reinventing Education*, S. Ebersold (Ed.). 2021. p. 195-218. <<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119817956.ch11>>

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. 27 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1996.

GADOTTI, Moacir. Qualidade na educação: uma nova abordagem. In: CONGRESSO DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA: qualidade na aprendizagem. Anais. Florianópolis: Rede Municipal de Ensino de Florianópolis, 2013.

GIROUX, Henry Armand. Cultural studies, public pedagogy and the responsibility of intellectuals. Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies. *The online platform for Taylor & Francis Group*. London. v. 1, n. 1, p. 59-79, 2004.

GOMES, Rafael Ferreira Diniz; AZEVEDO, Giselle Arteiro Nielsen. Educação Integral e Cidades Integradoras: Experiências Educativas em cidades brasileiras. *Revista de Arquitetura, Cidade e Contemporaneidade - PIXO*, v. 5, n. 16, p. 92-109, 2020. <<https://doi.org/10.15210/pixo.v5i16.19418>>

GOMES-SILVA, Amanda Santana. *ATENDIMENTO EDUCACIONAL ESPECIALIZADO EM ESCOLAS DE TEMPO INTEGRAL DA REDE MUNICIPAL DE ENSINO DE SÃO PAULO*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Especial). São Carlos: Universidade Federal de São Paulo, 2022. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufscar.br/handle/ufscar/16958>. Accessed on Jul. 27 2024.

GOMES-SILVA, Amanda Santana; ROMANO, Soraia; CABRAL, Leonardo Santos Amâncio. Acessibilidade Policêntrica: contribuições para além das práticas inclusivas centralizadoras. *Olhar de Professor*, v. 26, p. 1–15, 2023. DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.5212/OlharProfr.v.26.21657.054>>.

GOUVEIA, Maria Júlia Azevedo. Educação integral com a infância e a juventude. *Cadernos Cenpec*. v. 1, n. 2. p. 77-85, 2006. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18676/cadernoscenpec.v1i2.128>

MAINARDES, Jefferson. *Políticas Educacionais: questões e dilemas*. 1. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

MENDES, Enicéia Gonçalves; VILARONGA, Carla Ariela Rios; ZERBATO, Ana Paula. *Ensino Colaborativo como apoio à inclusão escolar: unindo esforços entre educação comum e especial*. São Carlos: EdUFSCAR, 2014.

MOLL, Jaqueline. (Org.). *Caminhos da Educação Integral no Brasil: direito a outros tempos e espaços educativos*. Porto Alegre: Penso - RS. 2012.

MORIN, Edgar. *Os Sete Saberes Necessários à Educação do Futuro*. Cortez Editora, 2000.

OLIVEIRA, Ana Augusta Sampaio; PRIETO, Rosângela Gavioli. Formação de Professores das Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais e Atuação com a Diversidade do Público-Alvo da Educação Especial. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial*. v. 26, n. 2, p. 343-360, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-54702020v26e0186>

SÃO PAULO. *Portaria nº 8.764, de 23 de dezembro de 2016*. Regulamenta o Decreto nº 57.379 que institui no Sistema Municipal de Ensino a Política Paulistana de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Paulistana. São Paulo, 2016.

TEIXEIRA, Anísio. Centro Educacional Carneiro Ribeiro. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*. v. 31, n. 73, p. 78-84, 1959. Disponível em: <http://www.bvanisioteixeira.ufba.br/artigos/cecr.htm> Acesso em: 03/08/2024.

TEIXEIRA, Anísio. *Educação é um direito*. Companhia Editora Nacional, 1961.

ZANARDI, Teodoro Adriano Costa. Educação integral, tempo integral e Paulo Freire: os desafios da articulação conhecimento-tempo-território. *Revista e-Curriculum*, São Paulo, v. 14, n. 1, p. 82-107, 2016.

Submitted: 22/12/2023

Preprint: 19/12/2023

Approved: 27/08/2024

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1 – Active participation in data collection, data analysis and writing of the text.

Author 2 – Coordinator and advisor of the research project, with participation in data analysis, review and writing of the text.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest with this article.