

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

THE SCHOOL MANAGER AND NATIONAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: JOINT NECESSARY

Rosalina Albuquerque Henrique

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9595-3434>

Iza Cristina Prado da Luz

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6591-5434>

Sérgio Renato Lima Pinto

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4881-8410>

Simone de Jesus da Fonseca Loureiro

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9707-1045>

Walter da Silva Braga

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9346-6210>

Rita de Cássia Bastos Silva

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0535-9226>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: In this work, we propose to analyze what function the manager needs to implement in the context of educational indicators to achieve a satisfactory result from the IDEB (Basic Education Development Index). Understanding that the school manager is one of the main articulators of the educational organization, which, with articulating and participatory engagement, can favor new learning and the consolidation of those already carried out or initiated by students, considering their experience at school and outside it. This demonstrates that evaluation overcomes bureaucratic conceptions that reduce it to mere inspection as an educational activity that has a social dimension. This way, we conclude that evaluation for school management is fundamental in the realization of democratic, participatory, transparent and ethical attitudes, affirming that it must be a collective decision, involving the whole school, teachers, students and parents so that the school institution is respected, whose main purpose is the promotion of the student by the community. **Keywords:** School management. Assessment. IDEB.

FIRST WORDS...

Any reformulation of the Political-Pedagogical Project allows us to “see with eyes to see” that the school goes beyond the merely bureaucratic vision. In addition, the school needs to be seen and experienced as an educational environment par excellence, in which the direct or indirect participants of this space make it a place of educational practices and learning in continuum construction. Such reflection led us to seek ways by which we could cultivate the old perspective that it is not possible to know the whole by the parts nor the parts by the whole, given that one complements the other, that is, we cannot

compartmentalize education, much less its external and internal relations with the school community.

Education must not happen without the presence of a hidden curriculum in which the student brings to the classroom his socioeconomic characteristics, his reading preferences, his cultural heritage and, why not, his political ideas. This means that our students are impregnated by a flood of new concepts and values, often disseminated by advertising images expressed on TV, magazines, newspapers, outdoors, social networks, cinema and, mainly, in the virtual world, which they bring to different social levels. approaches in vogue in society: political, social, economic, ethical crisis; child, domestic, urban and psychological violence, drugs, social abandonment, among others. A reality that is difficult to ignore, since it is precisely this reality that sensitizes the school manager to its participation and its empowerment. It is not appropriate to be present externally, for example, in elections, assemblies and meetings. In such a way that the school needs a “leader” to mobilize its employees, parents, technical, administrative, teaching staff and students for the transformation of this reality. What shows the generation in the change of communicating, working, deciding and thinking and managing a school.

For the improvement of public education, school management is one of the sources linked to changes in the school environment, and must be in line with the goals and policies established by the guidelines of national education, assumed by the Brazilian government from 1990 to the present day.

In this context, it is interesting to bring to our discussion the reading of “Ten new competences to teach”, by Perrenoud (2000), in which the scholar emphasizes the professional lucidity that consists of knowing when one can progress through

the means that the situation promotes. or from external means. This led us to realize how crucial it is for the school manager to participate and articulate with his administrative, pedagogical, operational team and with parents before and during the course of external evaluations. Given that, the results tell us how is the development of learning ability, through reading, writing and calculation of a particular student, class or even the school, based on observation protocols by level of competence and ability of the students.

Any evaluation in the field of education, in its core, represents a strategic action for the qualification of the work carried out by school management, concerned with improving the results of school performance; a task that is not done in the absence of a collective. We know that, in the 1980s, the universalization of Basic Education as a subjective public right was a constitutional commitment, which, ordinarily, is a social reality, or rather, a social commitment (of all of us), through the changes that plague our society.

Responsible for promoting the effectiveness of the school, it is believed that the school manager must be the one who directly participates in the discussions on the results of the external evaluative indicators of education; so that evaluating the school is to build a value in relation to the social function it has around the new challenges imposed by society, which imply in the students' learning results. This reflects the "knot" of the question that motivated the interest of the present study to be started with the following question: what actions become necessary for the school manager in the face of national education indicators?

We believe that educating is a daily disposition, at the same time, donation, in accepting the challenges of educating

children, young people and adults to citizenship and human development, which puts us to the test of points of view that we think are right or wrong in school education. The school manager is one of the main articulators of the educational organization that has social and ethical tasks adopting a democratic character, that is, the decentralization of power, therefore, it needs administrative and pedagogical knowledge, above all.

In practice, our students learn a lot with the school environment, with the forms of organization and relationship, which is a true condition of learning that mobilizes actions of school management to contribute with teachers in the significant results in the formation of their students and, therefore, in the growth of IDEB (Basic Education Development Index) of a given school alongside the approval rates.

A priori, the general objective of the work was to analyze what function the manager needs to implement in the context of the educational indicators of the system whose specific objectives were to identify the educational indicators at the system level to be analyzed in this article; as well as investigating at a theoretical level the principles that guide the performance of managers and relating the role of the manager in relation to national indicators.

To this end, the present study entitled "The school manager and national assessment system: necessary articulation" focused on a qualitative-explanatory, non-experimental approach, since we carried out data collection based on bibliographic sources of scholars of the subject in question, for this purpose, was added to the consultation of data from INEP (National Institute of Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira), available on the Federal Government website. Thus, the analyzes that will be made here are outlined

in two sections: 1) the school management in focus that encompasses legal principles, democratic management and the main attributions and 2) the national evaluation: IDEB indicators focusing on the evaluation system national, IDEB and the manager's articulation in face of IDEB data and, finally, the final considerations of the research.

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN FOCUS

THE LEGAL PRINCIPLES

It is a fact that the school manager has a leadership and administrator role with the task of organizing and managing the work of all the actors involved in the educational process; in the sense of promoting an educational environment capable of developing the potential of the students, fulfilled by the teaching activities in view of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, so that the means are in accordance with the objectives with good learning results for the students.

This conception came to be expressed in the Federal Constitution in 1988. (period when the school returned to being a social institution) in its article 206, which established the principles for Brazilian education, among them: obligatoriness, gratuity, freedom, equality and democratic management, regulated through complementary laws. What configured the process of Brazilian educational policy democratization ratified by the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education of n 9.394, of December 20, 1996, which deals with the norms of democratic management of public education in its articles 14 and 15:

Art. 14. The education systems defined the norms of democratic management of public education in basic education, according to their peculiarities and according to the following principles:

I – participation of education professionals in the elaboration of the school's pedagogical project;

II – participation of school and local communities in school or participatory councils.

Art. 15. Education systems ensured that public school units of basic education interact with progressive degrees of pedagogical, administrative and financial management autonomy, observing the general rules of public financial law (BRAZIL, 2014).

In addition, Law No. 10,172, of January 9, 2001, National Education Plan, came to corroborate in the sense of elucidating the guidelines and goals so that democratic management could occur in order to ensure better conditions for carrying out the work, whose participation by all is mandatory, as democracy in schools alone does not generate meaning (LIBÂNEO, 2015). In summary, the plan has as its main objective the democratic management of education linked to social participation:

a) the global increase in the population's level of education;

b) improving the quality of education at all levels;

c) the reduction of social and regional inequalities in terms of access and successful permanence in public education and the democratization of public education management in official establishments, complying with the principles of the participation of education professionals in the elaboration of the school's pedagogical project and the participation of school and local communities in school councils or equivalent (BRAZIL, 2001).

Unlike the XIX century, the contemporaneity of our schools (whether public or private) understands that the school organization is a space for learning, sharing, meanings, knowledge and actions between people. What values and intensifies the responsibility of the

direction and pedagogical coordination; Laws n° 9.394/96 and 10.172/2001 emphasize the promotion of democratic and participatory management, such as those that delegate autonomy to the school to seek its own solutions to its problems, needs and proposals.

DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT

As we discussed earlier, democratic management must be guided by legal principles and, above all, by the democratic method. Because, like it or not, the school is a social reality subjectively and socially constructed and not a given and objective structure; concept widely defended by Freire who advocated forms of participatory management with common goals assumed by all. This scholar declared that as a human practice he could never “understand education as a cold, soulless experience, in which feelings and emotions, desires, dreams must be repressed by a kind of reactionalist dictatorship” (FREIRE, 2001, p. 164-165)

It is not necessary to insist on the idea that the designation of the nomenclature administration gave way to democratic-participatory management, being, therefore, an evident factor initiated in the century XX between the 1980s, marked by a process of political opening, with popular participation and organization of society in the struggle for rights. In this direction, Moreira emphasizes that the expressive dynamics of contemporary reality and its movements make the “facts and phenomena change their meaning over time and consequently the words used to represent them fail to express all the richness of the new meaning” (MOREIRA, 2012, p. 2352).

The promulgation of the new LDB, n° 9.394/96, demonstrates that the main way to ensure the democratic management of the school is the participation in which democracy leads the school’s protagonists to greater participation and involvement in

decision-making; in such a way that Cury (2007, p. 494) establishes that democratic management is one:

Injunction of our Constitution (art. 37) (Brazil, 1988): transparency and impersonality, autonomy and participation, leadership and collective work, representativeness and competence. Aimed at a decision-making process based on public participation and deliberation, democratic management expresses a desire for the growth of individuals as citizens and for the growth of society as a democratic society.

In the meantime, behold, democratic management has an undeniable challenge: it must exempt the school environment from the negative and destructive competitiveness that involves capitalist relations of production and provide it with “greater autonomy, so that the school can manage itself without reproducing tendencies”. political-ideological currents, or even forms of discrimination, exclusion, oppression and violence” (MOREIRA, 2012, p. 2351). With this, democratic management needs to be an educational management strictly linked to participation, democracy, autonomy, self-control and responsibility especially.

The management of a school does not imply a pedagogical function. If we reflect better, we will come to the conclusion that the school manager has in his characteristic: that of a political agent, with the purpose of providing education, “which is par excellence a democratic action [...] and must be treated as such. in its conception and execution” (PARO, 2010, p. 776).

MAIN ATRIBUTIONS

Thinking about the main tasks necessary for a school manager to acquire positive results, even in the face of conflicting situations, which will not be free, as he interacts with a universe of people with

different ways of acting and thinking. It is having as an inherent mark of your position the awareness that there is in every person the power to exert influence over the context of which they are a part. Not paying attention to this is accepting very serious consequences to the good performance of a given organization, in our case, that of the educational context, which, according to Lück (2011, p. 30), “the lack of awareness of this interference results in a lack of awareness of the power of participation”.

Around this debate, Libâneo (2015, p. 97) considers the school as one that “can no longer be an isolated institution in itself, separated from the surrounding reality, but integrated into a community that interacts with the broader social life”. Thus, it is through participation that people develop an awareness of what they are as a social subject, mobilizing energy and as an effective part of a work, or even being the main articulator of an action.

The school manager is the director and main responsible for the educational institution, it is he who has the overall vision that articulates and integrates the various sectors such as: administrative, pedagogical, secretariat, general services, relationship with the school community, among others. To this end, Libâneo (2015, p. 179-180) highlights the ten attributions of a school manager, which represent the main:

- 1) Supervise and be responsible for all administrative and pedagogical activities of the school, as well as activities with parents and the community and with other instances of civil society.
- 2) Ensure the conditions and means of maintaining a favorable working environment and material conditions necessary to achieve the school's objectives, including responsibility for the property and its proper use.

- 3) To promote integration and articulation between the school and the community, with the support and initiative of the School Council, through pedagogical, scientific, social, sporting and cultural activities.

- 4) Organize and coordinate the planning activities and the pedagogical-curricular project, together with the pedagogical coordination, as well as monitor, evaluate and control their execution.

- 5) Know the educational and teaching legislation, the rules issued by Organs competent bodies and the School Regulation, ensuring their compliance.

- 6) Ensure the application of the institution's operating guidelines and disciplinary rules, investigating or investigating irregularities of any nature, in a transparent and explicit way, keeping the school community systematically informed of the measures.

- 7) Check and sign school documents, forward processes or correspondence and school files, in agreement with the school secretary.

- 8) Supervise documents and evaluation of the productivity of the school as a whole, including the evaluation of the pedagogical project, school organization, curriculum and teachers.

- 9) To seek all the means and conditions that favor the professional activity of specialist pedagogues, teachers, employees, aiming at a good quality of education.

- 10) Supervise and be responsible for the financial organization and control of school expenses, in agreement with the School Council, specialist pedagogues and teachers.

In public schools, in private schools and in large networks of social organizations (whether political, economic, cultural, etc...) knowledge, according to Perrenoud (2000, p. 92), “does not allow controlling all events, but helps to anticipate them, to name them, to de-dramatize them”, to understand that they are inherent to the ordinary divergences to the

dynamics of a certain group. For this reason, Perrenoud defends, in his studies concerning the educational area, the development of competences, “the ability to act effectively in a certain type of situation, based on knowledge, but not limited to it” (BRAZIL, 2008, p. 18).

In addition, the school manager has attributions and skills to diagnose and propose assertive solutions about the causes that generate conflicts, as well as knowing how to promote gains in the quality of teaching by improving the productivity of school professionals when choosing the appropriate tools and techniques for the job.

The co-participation of the school manager is essential for educational systems, as he acts as a facilitator of collective competences in an institution. It is not necessary for each participant to know how to do everything, but it is essential that all the required skills (communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, flexible planning, symbolic integration) are present. And, they are linked to knowledge of innovation, which must not be monopolized in any statute of the school. Thus, we consider that among the ten new teaching skills disseminated by Perrenoud, the one that best interacts with our point of discussion are the skills: participating in school administration and informing and involving parents.

Cultivating these aforementioned competences also has repercussions as an attribution of the manager, as it combats the old “sewing” of educational systems of having a school management based on distrust rather than trust, on clandestine freedom than on assumed autonomy and the appearance of control over the than in the transparency of choices. Organizing and making students’ participation evolve is to face the contradiction between the desire to emancipate them and the temptation to shape them; however, if we want the democratization of education,

we can only defend an active pedagogy that has been qualified as differentiated, which involves parents, also winning over the most reluctant ones (PERRENOUD, 2000).

THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT: IDEB INDICATORS

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Within the school context, evaluation assumes a central role of being the thermometer of the educator’s action to reflect the level of quality of school work, because the entire educational system demands the presence of evaluation that accompanies the teaching process step by step and student learning; this demonstrates, therefore, to be a pedagogical act, which obliges all actors involved in the school environment to participate in this conjuncture that is continuous and flexible to changes, according to the objective set by contemporary society.

Currently, all Brazilian educational establishments undergo evaluation programs, as long as they are regularized according to the Ministry of Education (MEC); in this regard, the evaluation of education in our country has become a State policy based on political reforms and educational actions implemented since the 1990s (with the structuring of LDB n° 9.394/96, in particular).

MEC’s official documents state that national-level assessment seeks to verify the quality of education in a country, establishing general norms and standards for education. In the case of Brazil, we have the Basic Education Assessment System; the National High School Exam; the National Student Performance Exam, which are coordinated by the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research (INEP).

The external evaluative indicators were created so that they could monitor the achievement of the five Goals for Brazilian

Public Education¹, that will raise their quality to the expected level that developed countries have. In this sense, the evaluative approach linked to an external indicator has a well-defined function: to scale the learning results in order to measure the quality of the education offered and favor the economic growth of our country. Thus, it is necessary to recognize the value not only of internal evaluations, but in addition to them, the elaboration of external evaluation programs that can provide the self-knowledge and management that one wants to have when one achieves serious, democratic and transparent work, allowing society to monitor and demand the evolution of educational indicators for the improvement of education.

In summary, we highlight Provinha Brasil, National Literacy Assessment, Prova Brasil, National High School Exam and National Student Performance Exam as the main external educational evaluative indicators developed by the Federal Government.

According to INEP, the Provinha Brasil is a diagnostic assessment of the literacy level of children enrolled in the 2nd year of schooling in Brazilian public schools, which takes place in two stages (at the beginning and at the end of the school year) of Elementary School. The application in different periods allows teachers and educational managers to find out what was added in the children's learning within the evaluated period.

The National Literacy Assessment is a census assessment that is carried out annually, incorporated into the Basic Education Assessment System by Ordinance n° 482, of June 7, 2013. This exam analyzes the literacy and literacy levels in Portuguese and Mathematics of students of the 3rd year

of Elementary Education in public schools, according to INEP. In addition to performance tests, which measure students' proficiency in these areas, the ANA presents in its first edition (2013) the following contextual information: the Socioeconomic Level Indicator and the School's Teacher Training Indicator.

The Prova Brasil (National Assessment of School Performance) is an assessment of the quality of Elementary Education in Brazilian public schools in the areas of Portuguese Language and Mathematics. The 5th and 9th grade classes that have 20 students or more enrolled in public schools of municipal, state and federal networks are evaluated; its execution takes place biannually.

The National High School Exam (ENEM) is an individual, voluntary exam offered annually to students who are completing or who have completed high school in previous years; It also serves for adults who have not completed elementary school at the right age to obtain a certificate of completion of high school. In 2009, the exam began to serve as a selection mechanism for admission to higher education, generating constructive changes to the democratization of opportunities for access to vacancies offered by Federal Institutions of Higher Education (IFES), for academic mobility and, finally, to induce restructuring of high school curricula. In addition, the results of this exam can be used for access to higher education as a single selection phase or combined with your own selection processes.

The National Student Achievement Exam (ENADE) is one of the evaluation procedures of the National Higher Education Evaluation System (SINAES) mandatory for selected students and an indispensable condition for the issuance of the academic transcript.

1. The goals to be achieved are: every child and young person aged between 4 and 17 in school; every fully literate child up to the age of eight; every student with learning appropriate to their grade; every student with high school completed up to the age of 19; investment in education expanded and well managed. These goals comprehensively portray the results needed to improve education. They are general guidelines that encompass the different activities carried out in each school, municipality or state. Cf. BITTENCOURT (2013, p. 1-2).

ENADE evaluates the performance of students in undergraduate courses, entering and concluding, in relation to the syllabus provided for in the curricular guidelines of the respective undergraduate course.

IDEB

In 2007, the Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (INEP) created the Basic Education Development Index (IDEB) as a means of verifying the average performance in external assessments and the school flow of Brazilian students, as these are urgent measures of quality of education at the national level; to this end, the bodies linked to the Ministry of Education (MEC) set goals with the aim of reaching 6.0 points by 2022, an average corresponding to the educational system of developed countries. The performance averages used are those of the Prova Brasil, for schools and municipalities, and of the Basic Education Assessment System (SAEB), for the states and the country, carried out every two years, which in its first sampling in 2005 recorded a national average of 3.8 points.

In fact, IDEB represents more than a statistical indicator, which is why the new Law nº 13.005/2014 (PNE) reinforces the execution of the goals of Law nº 10.172/2001 and guides the improvement of public policies in the administrative and pedagogical improvement for the undergraduate and graduate courses; In addition, it provides the opportunity for schools in their political-pedagogical project to design individual intermediate goals to increase the quality of education, allowing society to closely monitor the evolution of educational indicators, especially in schools that have not yet managed to reach approval rates on the goal. longed for by them.

MANAGER'S ARTICULATION WITH IDEB DATA

The applicability of the evaluation practice in Brazilian educational institutions has suffered an avalanche of criticism for “reducing itself to the control function, through which a quantitative classification of students is made relative to the grades they obtained in the tests” (LIBÂNEO, 1994, page: 198). This is due to a culture in which evaluating students and how much they have learned is an irrefutable and arbitrary task of the teacher, incorporated by parents and by the students themselves. “This mentality is incorporated in such a way that the idea that the pedagogical work belongs only to the teacher begins to be neutralized” (SORDI; LUDKE, 2009, p. 314), reinforcing the idea that evaluation involves only the interior space of the teacher. classroom, focused on student learning.

In recent years, government public policies have demonstrated that the evaluation process is a collective work, in which all social actors must be part of this process. Evaluating students' school performance is undoubtedly a crucial purpose, but it is not the only objective, because the term evaluation is gaining more and more scope.

The evaluation treatment starts to have a commitment to understand the entire pedagogical process and to seek alternatives to improve it in the school context, in all its segments. Not only the students are evaluated, but it includes the teacher, the school, the educational system and, mainly, also the school manager. In short, evaluation distances itself from the social imaginary fed by a “punitive evaluation concept” (CUNHA, 2005, p. 204). Today, focused on student training activity that is evaluated at different times, with different purposes.

It is necessary to emphasize that “the evaluation carries, in itself, elements of

regulation and emancipation, and a balance between these two forces is assumed” (CUNHA, 2005, p. 2), because denying the regulatory function, it closes itself on the “clinical view” of the educational reality, because, by distancing itself from the emancipatory function, it disregards the subjects and cultures of the protagonists. It was with this in mind that the MEC gave centrality to external evaluation processes, which affect new contours in the school management scenario, modifying attitudes related to teaching-learning and the professionalism of teachers in basic education and university education.

For Zanchet, the idea of centralizing the evaluation processes of all levels of education in a single national agency (INEP) followed the model of public policies in several countries and “has its origins in the guidelines of the World Bank, aiming at the implementation of the educational reform” and the supposed improvement in the quality of education” (ZANCHET apud CUNHA, 2005, p. 163). This way, it is believed that this values the expressive social participation and resizes the daily pedagogical practice, while the institutional evaluation discusses the improvement in the performance of professionals in education and contributes to the excellence of the quality of education as an end activity.

Bittencourt (2013) positively emphasizes the use of the results of external evaluative indicators as a way of monitoring the unfolding in the pedagogical aspect of the school caused by these exams managed by INEP:

Among the recommendations given to State and Municipal managers, [...] it is suggested that they use these results to improve their policies and programs, because without external evaluation, it is very difficult to know if, for example, measures such as teacher training, improvement of teaching conditions, democratic management, implementation of salary plans linked to

performance, school autonomy and other measures are, or are not, having a positive impact on the quality of education. This means that, without an objective instrument to measure the results, it is not possible to know if teaching is really improving or not. / Transparency and dissemination of the results of external evaluations are also requested, which allow the school itself, families, community organizations and, mainly, the local government to take a stand on the situation and adopt convergent and complementary actions, with the objective of overcome the difficulties encountered (BITTENCOURT, 2013, p. 6).

Higher education and basic education institutions are committed to uniting their reflections to think of strategies to improve Brazilian education, transforming numbers and data into administrative (infrastructure field) and pedagogical (teaching and teaching) indicators.

When there is a self-assessment and systematic recording of information, they allow school managers to make judicious decisions and correct directions during the execution of educational programs, also providing a given public opinion with the results achieved, in order to expand their social recognition. In addition, information transparency and social control grant greater legitimacy to policies and favor probity in the use of public resources (UNESCO, 2008).

Quantitative data, in itself, do not help us to gain self-knowledge, on the contrary, it discourages changes in institutional actors. However, when we seek to interpret qualitative data, they offer criteria of merit, usefulness, effectiveness, relevance and quality for the choice of investment priorities, in addition to allowing us to verify the results under the goals established in the planning of administrative and pedagogical policies at education (basic, technological and higher education).

It is common to hear from any organizational system that the desired changes can come

from “bottom up”, however, when designing them, it is understood that there is a need for a main articulator, which will serve as a paradigm for the people who belong to a given organizational system. , which, in our case, is the school. Based on this understanding, we opted for participatory leadership. Because, “the formal leader creates the climate, the atmosphere and gives the appropriate signal to his employees that participation is really wanted” (LÜCK, et al. 2005, p. 35), while overcoming the old bureaucratic conceptions. that reduce him to a mere administrative inspector, locked in a cabinet.

Research on effective schools reveals a very positive correlation between the segments of the school, celebrating a contract that aims at a social dimension in which the student is promoted and, consequently, society through simple actions, which based on good In this sense, “the delegation of authority to those who are involved in carrying out educational services is built on models of shared leadership, which are the working patterns of organizations” (LÜCK, et al. 2005, p. 35) efficient, demonstrating a good performance.

Among its various articles, Nova Escola Magazine (2014) addressed good examples of schools in poor neighborhoods of cities in Ceará, Tocantins and Goiás, which decided to face the reality and the transformations that the educational world has been going through, facing important decisions within the school. that influenced the change of practice, contributing significantly to the advancement of IDEB. The managers of these schools advanced when they decided to promote a participatory team as they sought to share their knowledge, advances and setbacks, cementing trust: capital for the conditions of organizational success.

The manager Maria Janete Braga de Souza (since 2010) of EM Maria Alves de Mesquita (which is located in Pedra Branca, Ceará) as

soon as she took over the direction decided to take some actions to improve the school’s IDEB, which, according to INEP, was 3.5 in 2007, rising to 6.7 in 2013. Its main articulations were: first, to stipulate a weekly plan with the teachers and coordinators in order to reprogram the learning with monitoring by the secretariats; use well the resources that the school has to improve its infrastructure; ensure the continuing education of teachers; increase the frequency of planning; encourage parents’ schooling through technical visits to be enrolled in the EJA (offered at their child’s own school) and ensure the continuity of good initiatives for future managers.

Faced with an IDEB from 4.7 in 2007 to 7.2 in 2013, the manager Maria de Fátima of EM Beatriz Rodrigues da Silva (located in Palmas, Tocantins) believes that only the involvement of parents and the rules of coexistence are not a guarantee of learning (although they are welcome). When he took over the direction, he decided to discuss the problems with his team in the interest of diagnosing the students’ learning needs, for this it was important to research good references of effective schools, whose result focused on the improvement of time management in the classroom with the elaboration of its own didactic material, aimed at the needs of children and adolescents, which improved homework; the creation of reinforcement groups made it possible to have a new look at the students, since the difficulties of each student were worked on top of their potential. And, understanding the descriptors of external evaluations supported the adoption of monthly evaluations programmed by the school team.

For manager Margareth Martins Arantes from EM João Batista Filho (Acreúna, Goiás), an important aspect is to make good use of the evaluation, realizing what is demanded in external evaluations, since the first results

of the school's IDEB were not satisfactory for anyone, since the descriptors are unknown. Faced with an IDEB of 3.6 in 2007, the school was forced to join forces to establish goals and support bridges for teachers and students, therefore, management and coordination began to closely monitor the work in the classroom, observing the teacher's plan book according to the descriptors; ensure the articulation between the cycles based on individual files in which teachers record students' progress and difficulties every two months, serving as a basis for the annual planning of the new teacher for the following year (the teacher of the previous year meets with the current one during the day pedagogical, which precedes the beginning of the school year); guarantee the collective pedagogical time at least once a month and every 15 days with the direction plus the coordination, which can thus promote an individual meeting with a teacher offering him possible subsidies. This could result in an astonishing IDEB of 7.2 in 2013, the result of a management that influenced its team to see that the problem of a class is a problem of the school.

Through the engagement (LÜCK, 2011) of a management that is articulating and participatory in situations that challenge the involvement, including and especially that of the students, to solve problems, thus, it is possible to favor new learning and the consolidation of the ones carried out. or initiated by each child and each young student, considering their experience at school and outside it, this way, the evaluation is an important part of this work of analysis of how the pedagogical process is taking place.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

We consider it important to note that the school has always been a place to think

critically about education, so it is natural that new knowledge emerges and that some changes take place. For, whatever the path that educators may take, it is necessary to have as a horizon the democratic dimension with social and political praxis, this means having a starting point, anchored in experiences, or rather, in significant practices.

The look at evaluation in the educational context, which was summarized in the performance of exams in the service of a mere "passage" to the following year, today, does not involve only numbers, but people who respond to society's demands. Requirements in the personal, social, professional and educational context.

Contemporary society appreciates no one who has the information, especially if it pays attention to what it knows how to do with it. It is essential to change and reflect on school curricula that must now involve guiding principles in their educational projects: interdisciplinarity and contextualization; therefore, it is still indisputable that assessment is a component present in our personal, family and professional daily life. People express judgments about what we do and what we say. By the way, we ourselves evaluate our choices at all times. We often have to stop for a while and analyze what is good and identify what is not good and needs to be improved, to take stock of our life.

Among all aspects of educational action, evaluation for school management is fundamental for the realization of democratic, participatory, transparent and ethical action, stating that it must be a collective decision, involving the whole school, teachers, students and parents so that the school institution is respected by the community.

Based on readings and some data collected about the 2013 IDEB, all available on the INEP website, we reiterate the idea that verification instruments are means by which

information is obtained about the reasons for advances, permanence and setbacks. of our students' academic performance. Bearing in mind that for the MEC, the evaluation makes it possible to see the dimension of the quality of education offered to our children, youth and adults and what still needs to be improved in schools at the federal, state and municipal levels.

In addition, the reality of monitoring the quality of basic education, through indicators, is an essential activity for guiding and evaluating public educational policies and ways of managing the country's education systems.

Learning institutional evaluation as an indicator of transformation and influence on the performance of school management includes knowing how to position oneself in the face of data provided by external evaluations,

using them as a school reinterpretation from its social actors. To assume this perspective is to confirm the school as a social space in which people perform different roles in order to promote the development and learning of the student class.

However, when decisions are taken collectively, it does not mean that the success of the school resides in the figure of the only leader, that is, in the person of the school director. On the contrary, as a school manager, your performance must be very attentive to pedagogical, cultural, administrative and financial knowledge in order to diagnose the difficulties, problems and advances of students and only this way resize its management, understanding the school as a whole by becoming a true articulator facing difficult situations and consolidating good teaching ideas.

REFERENCES

BITTENCOURT, Neide Arrias. **Avaliação institucional como instrumento da gestão escolar**. Disponível em: <<http://escoladegestores.virtual.ufc.br/PDF/Avalia%C3%A7ao%20Institucional%20como%20Instrumento%20da%20Gestao%20Escolar.pdf>>. Acesso: em 22 abr. 2022.

BRASIL. **Constituição, 1988**. Constituição Federal. São Paulo: Lex, 1988.

BRASIL. **LDB**: Lei e diretrizes e bases da educação nacional: Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. 9. ed. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, Edições Câmara, 2014.

BRASIL. **PDE**: Plano de Desenvolvimento da Educação: SAEB: ensino médio: matrizes de referência, tópicos e descritores. Brasília: MEC, SEB; Inep, 2008.

BRASIL. **Plano Nacional de Educação 2014-2024**: Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014, que aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação (PNE) e dá outras providências. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, Edições Câmara, 2014.

BRASIL. **Plano Nacional de Educação**: Lei nº 10.172, de 9 de janeiro de 2001, aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação e dá outras providências. Disponível em: <https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/leis_2001/l10172.htm>. Acesso em: 22 abr. 2022.

CUNHA, Maria Isabel da (org.). **Formatos avaliativos e concepção de docência**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2005.

CURY, Carlos Roberto Jamil. A gestão democrática na escola e o direito à educação. **Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação**, v. 23, n. 3, p. 483-495, set./dez. 2007.

FERREIRA, Anna Rachel; MAZZOCO, Bruno; MEIRELLES, Elisa. Foco na aprendizagem: três instituições em bairros pobres contam como alcançaram bons resultados no Ideb. **Nova Escola**, São Paulo, ano 29, n. 277, p. 76-79, novembro 2014.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da autonomia**: saberes necessários à prática educativa. 19. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2001.

INEP. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. Disponível em:<ideb.inep.gov.br/>. Acesso em: 20 abr. 2022.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. **Didática**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1994.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. **Organização e gestão da escola**: teoria e prática. 6. ed. rev. e ampl.: São Paulo: Heccus Editora, 2015.

LÜCK, Heloísa *et al.* **A escola participativa**: o trabalho do gestor escolar. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2005.

LÜCK, Heloísa. **A gestão participativa na escola**. 9. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2011. [Série Cadernos de Gestão]

MOREIRA, Verônica Martins. Gestão educacional e prática docente na realidade escolar. **Enciclopédia Biosfera**, Centro Científico Conhecer, Goiânia, v. 8, n. 15, p. 2346-2374, 2012.

PARO, Vitor Henrique. A educação, a política e a administração: reflexões sobre a prática do diretor de escola. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 36, n. 3, p. 763-778, set./dez. 2010.

PERRENOUD, Philippe. **Dez novas competências para ensinar**. Trad. Patrícia Chittoni Ramos. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

SANT'ANNA, Ilza Martins. **Por que avaliar? Como avaliar?** Critérios e Instrumentos. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 1995.

SORDI, Maria Regina Lemes de; LUDKE, Menga. Da avaliação da aprendizagem à avaliação institucional: aprendizagens necessárias. **Avaliação (Campinas)**, Sorocaba, v. 14, n. 2, jul. 2009.

UNESCO. 7º Desafio: desenvolver uma cultura de avaliação. In: **Alfabetização de jovens e adultos no Brasil**: lições de prática. Brasília: UNESCO, 2008.