International Journal of **Human Sciences Research**

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT AND PEDAGOGICAL INNOVATION: THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS IN BASIC EDUCATION

Roberto Carlos Ramos
Post-Doctorate in Education from ``Universidade La Salle Canoas``/RS. Director at Colégio La Salle Carmo – Caxias do Sul/RS

Marina Camargo Mincato
PhD student in Education at ``Universidade de Caxias do Sul``/RS. English Language Coordinator at Colégio La Salle Carmo – Caxias do Sul/RS

Gêise Rúbia de Souza Ortiz
Master's student in Education at ``Universidade La Salle Canoas``/RS. Director of the Vó Babali Municipal Early Childhood Education School – Canoas/RS

Caroline Janaíni Silva de Ávila
Master's student in Education at ``Universidade La Salle Canoas`` /RS. Director of the Tia Maria Lúcia Municipal Early Childhood Education School – Canoas/RS

1

Abstract: The bibliographic research focuses on reflection on school management and pedagogical innovation in Basic Education, with the research problem being: How do the authors address the themes arising from school management and pedagogical innovation in the context of Basic Education? Based on this problem, the objective of the research is to understand how the authors approach themes related to the relationships between school management and pedagogical innovation, in the context of Basic Education. The theoretical framework has as its structuring axis the assumptions of Lück about school management and Carbonell regarding pedagogical innovation, establishing a dialogue with other authors who discuss the themes under study. The main results are: a) School management and pedagogical innovation in the context of Basic Education, boosting the quality of education and meaningful learning; b) The importance of the dimensions of pedagogical innovation, such as the contribution to teacher training, the pedagogical sustainability of the school and the consolidation of a reflective methodology; c) Promoting the continued training of managers in different areas of school management and pedagogical innovation; d) The dissemination of school management and pedagogical innovation through the promotion of research and the publication of articles in journals and events during the research, whether book chapters and participation as speakers at congresses, seminars and panels, among others; e) Contribution to the advancement of discussions, in academic-scientific terms regarding the investigative theme of the research.

INTRODUCTION

The transformations of society in the 21st century, caused by several aspects, including new information and communication technologies, have placed schools in the spotlight and led them to realize that, in the school context, there is a lack of interconnection between forms of teaching and learning with the digital culture of knowledge. It is assumed, then, the need for different elements that provide qualitative and innovative changes in pedagogical practice, which implies a change in the components of the current educational model involving content, methods, materials, assessment practices, the role of the teacher and the role of students.

However, the modern school has made few changes over time, when, truly, it must be the space in which the entire school community can get involved in the construction of quality education, aimed at pleasurable and, therefore, meaningful learning.

From the perspective of school management, its managers have the mission of articulating the school's training processes in line with social reality, requiring this professional not only to have technical mastery of administrative procedures, but also the ability to dialogue with their peers, in addition to clear perception of the social context and innovations required by the school. This demonstrates that the concept of school management has undergone changes following many discussions throughout the history of education. (LÜCK, 2009).

For this change to constitute an innovative practice, it must have an impact on the curriculum, producing quality, knowledge and learning for everyone involved, because, according to Farias (2006), innovation requires planning, systematization, intervention and participation of people who have given commitment.

To point to innovation as a guiding

assumption of educational practice, in this sense, does not mean adopting the new because it is different, but assuming its historical dimension and, mainly, seeking to break technical teaching-learning practices, given that these do not enable critical reflection on the historical, political, social and cultural facts existing in educational practice. Therefore, we must remember that "If every innovation carries with it an intention to change, not every change necessarily introduces innovation." (FERNANDES, 2000, p. 48)

Abramovay (2003) presents, based on a study carried out by UNESCO in 2002, successful experiences in schools, from which the importance of school management and pedagogical innovation in improving learning and school results becomes evident. The findings of this study reaffirm the idea that, to learn, the individual needs to be motivated, sensitized and interested in the information presented. However, the current school model is not aimed at motivating this interest.

This bibliographical research, based on a literature analysis, aims to understand how authors approach themes relating to the relationships between school management and pedagogical innovation, in the context of Basic Education.

The bibliographical research focuses on the contributions of academic-scientific production to the reflection on School Management and Pedagogical Innovation in Basic Education. According to Gil (2019, p. 28): "bibliographical research is prepared based on already published material. Traditionally, this type of research includes printed material, such as books, magazines, newspapers, theses, dissertations and annals of scientific events". The steps to be observed in the bibliographic research, still according to Gil (2019, p. 42) are the following: "Choose the topic. Preliminary bibliographic survey. Problem formulation. Preparation of the provisional plan for the matter. Search for sources. Reading the material. Registration. Logical organization of the subject. Writing of the text."

The theoretical framework is organized into structuring axes in accordance with the assumptions of Lück (2009; 2011) regarding school management and Carbonell, (2002), regarding pedagogical innovation, establishing a dialogue with other authors who discuss the themes under study.

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

For Ogawa and Filipak (2013), the context of constant changes in society, the result of countless innovations in the scientific and technological sphere, has imposed on social institutions the need to adapt, to change their way of acting, to review the way they operate. relate to your audience. However, the modern school has made few changes over time, when, truly, it must be the space in which the entire school community can get involved in building quality education, aimed at meaningful and enjoyable learning.

In this sense, the role of the school manager is important, as he is responsible for organizing and managing relationships and pedagogical work. In addition, it has the mission of articulating the school's training processes in line with social reality, with this professional not only needing technical mastery of administrative procedures, but also the ability to dialogue with their peers, in addition to a clear perception of the social and of the innovations required of the school.

In this conception, the school manager plays more of a mediator role in the process of transforming the school, considering that the conduct of his functions includes autonomy, participation and decentralization of administrative power, thus giving the right to voice and listening to different representations. and associations.

This way, school management, from a democratic perspective, is essential to building a participatory culture, which implies overcoming bureaucratic and centralized processes, both in terms of decision-making and in the experience of management, emerging collective discussions, which involve different segments of the school, from pedagogical to administrative.

According to Lück (2009, p.69), "a democratic school is one in which its participants are collectively organized and committed to promoting quality education for all". Therefore, the school management process must be understood as feasibility of interaction, which, from a democratic perspective, aims to organize a participatory process, through which people at school discuss, plan and solve problems.

PERSPECTIVES OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

In order to understand the conceptions rooted in the figure of the school manager, it is necessary to return to the understanding of the term *school management*, as, in many moments, it was used with the same meaning as school administration, although they are terms that differ from the practice and political construction.

For Ogawa and Filipak (2013), unlike administration, which assumes the figure of an administrator in command, school management elucidates participation as a process of building actions and procedures that involve pedagogical practice in the school environment, thus, part of the collective as a premise for establishing the identity of the school institution and involves all segments in the discussion of educational processes. In this sense, "school management promotes the redistribution of responsibilities that aim to intensify the legitimacy of the school system" (LÜCK et al., 2011, p. 16).

It must be understood, then, that school administration aims to plan, organize and apply financial resources for the proper functioning of the institution, with its main function being to ensure the alignment of the various administrative sectors. School management, in turn, must be focused on encouraging leaders and motivating the team to emphasize educational quality.

Still for Ogawa and Filipak (2013), school management encourages the importance of differentiated action on the part of the manager. Therefore, it requires not only a professional who knows how to manage financial resources, manage administrative actions, but who is able to lead, organize, mobilize and coordinate school professionals.

PEDAGOGICAL INNOVATION

The current school has the mission of helping to navigate the current reality autonomously, to contribute to beautifying and dignifying it and to dreaming of the future in which, based on equality in fact and in law, the growth and projection of diversities. In this sense, teaching acquires new meanings and meanings to relate to new communication technologies, to read and better understand reality and to assimilate the rich inherited cultural tradition and many other emerging and changing cultural expressions, which remain largely absent. official school culture. (CARBONELL, 2002).

According to Carbonell (2002, p. 16), in the historical context in which we find ourselves, "We cannot look back towards the school anchored in the past, which was limited to reading, writing, counting and passively receiving a shower of general culture", and furthermore, it is urgent to train for the new citizenship and this "... requires from the first years of schooling, another type of knowledge and a more active participation of students in the learning process".

School managers are challenged, according to Carbonell (2002, p. 16-17), to think about the "present-future" school and, to this end, it is necessary to "change the format" of pedagogical management, from a perspective attentive and nuanced, expressed by a training model that is in tune between thinking and feeling and between the development of abstraction and the different aspects of personality, associated with a "significant act" to the educational proposal, through knowledge and affection, of thought and feelings, of reasoning and morality, of the academic and the person, of learning and values. In other words, obtaining a comprehensive education present in several innovative pedagogies such as Gardner (1995) in his theory of multiple intelligences and the basic pillars of education proposed by Dellors (1996) to UNESCO: learning to know; learn to do; learn to act; and learn to live together.

These pillars contribute to more solid training, when innovative proposals facilitate more attractive, effective and successful learning. In turn, from a pedagogical and school management perspective, it is necessary to introduce a renewing line, new projects and programs, teaching models and other ways of managing and organizing the curriculum, school and class dynamics. (CARBONELL, 2002).

Pedagogical innovation, in certain contexts, is associated with pedagogical renewal, change and improvement, but all improvement implies change and modernization. Thus, the simple modernization of the school has nothing to do with innovation, but the information society, cutting-edge technologies that seek to open paths in the field of innovation in school spaces. This innovation, "...that delves into the important things of a new comprehensive and comprehensive training. " (CARBONELL, 2002, p. 21).

Therefore, innovating does not necessarily mean talking about changes that occur in the teacher's pedagogical practice, especially with regard to teaching methodology. Innovation does not always mean changing and, furthermore, the methodological aspects are those that undergo the least changes. It is in this aspect that the greatest resistance and difficulties are usually encountered, as many educators still show resistance to adopting innovative elements in their pedagogical practice.

ARTICULATION BETWEEN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT AND PEDAGOGICAL INNOVATION

In the school space, school management and pedagogical innovation require a broad and systemic look on the part of the leaders who work there. To this end, articulation between school management and pedagogical innovation becomes essential, aiming for an integrative perspective and action, in which the actions are clear and effective.

Furthermore, for school management and pedagogical innovation to materialize at school, it is necessary for managers and teachers to challenge themselves with the desire to change their pedagogical practice and school management, especially the innovation process, which leaves them distressed., apprehensive, afraid of changing and not seeing visible results. Generally, it requires a certain amount of time for teachers and managers to internalize the idea of innovation and reflect on the change as a redefinition of educational practice in the school context, thus reflecting on qualified school management.

In this sense, Lück (2009, p. 97) highlights the importance of management and leadership:

> The exercise of management presupposes leadership, as management cannot be carried out without exercising leadership. As indicated by Lück, (2007), management

emerges in overcoming administration, based on the recognition of human dynamics in social organizations and overcoming the mechanistic focus.

Thus, a change in conception is assumed, as management advocates a new perspective of school organization in which the work of school managers must be intertwined, aiming at the quality of the educational process.

From this perspective, Carbonell, (2002, p. 26) highlights that

> In fact, it takes a long time to change practices and attitudes embedded in ideological and cultural processes. The time of school culture is penetrating like a gentle but persistent trickle and cannot be imposed overnight, whether by decree or by the voluntary action of teachers.

Therefore, it can be seen that school management and innovative pedagogical practices do not occur through decrees, since they focus much more on "processes than on the product, more on the journey than on the arrival." (CARBONELL, 2002, p. 25).

Effective school management and pedagogical innovation instigate changes in the school context, mainly in the classroom and in the teacher's pedagogical practice. Teachers are primarily responsible for implementing and/or promoting the innovative process, regardless of the influence of structural, institutional factors, among others. Without teachers, it becomes impossible to innovate, with the feeling of motivation and the drive for changes in their practices being essential.

As Carbonell (2002, p. 30) states:

> The main driving force for change are the teachers who work in a coordinated and cooperative manner in schools and who are committed to strengthening school democracy. A commitment that, following a movement from the bottom up, is aimed at obtaining a comprehensive education that articulates the experiences of students and real social problems with school culture, overcoming a narrow, technical and academicist view of school performance.

School management has many factors that can facilitate and/or encourage pedagogical innovation in the school context. These are factors that, if well-articulated and planned by everyone who is part of the process, truly enable innovation, as well as the experience of differentiated educational practices at school that certainly drove the necessary changes to the demands of education in the current context.

Carbonell, (2002, p. 31) highlights some factors that enable pedagogical innovation:

> 1. Solid teaching teams and a receptive educational community – that is, a team of stable teachers open to change with a desire to change the school;
>
> 2. Exchange and cooperation networks, critical advisors and collaborators and other external support – which can occur from experiences with other schools through information technologies;
>
> 3. Experience, reflection and evaluation. How to measure success – create organizations so that innovation can be experienced in all its intensity and at the same time be rigorously evaluated to continue advancing in this process.

Libâneo et al (2003, p. 289) highlights the fact that, to exercise their profession with better quality, the teacher/manager must:

> [...] know well the functioning of the school system (educational policies, legal guidelines, relations between school and society, etc.) and schools (their internal organization, forms of management, curriculum, methods of teaching, the teacher-student relationship, community participation, etc.), in addition to being able to establish relationships between these two instances.

Therefore, it is not enough to just elect the school director for school management and innovation to take place, it is necessary

for the entire school community (teachers, pedagogical coordinators, parents, students) to participate in decisions in a critical and conscious way, taking into consideration, that the main objective of the school institution must be to provide a quality teaching and learning process.

Carbonell (2022) highlights as a driving element of pedagogical innovation the critical attitude towards practice, which leads educators to the capacity for self-analysis, to ask questions about their own performance as educators, to point out their own flaws in the development of their educational actions and to recognize them in a self-critical way.

The participation and engagement of the various actors who work at the school with the educational project are an essential condition for school management and pedagogical innovation. Such participation and engagement can constitute an "instrument that induces consensus, communion and convergence of objectives and interests, in short, guaranteeing a climate and culture conducive to the effective achievement of educational objectives". (TORRES, PALHARES, 2009, p.94).

Aspects such as planning, teacher training, availability of resources, pedagogical support, recognition, teacher appreciation and the flexibility of teaching thinking, among others, also contribute to innovative practices being developed in the school context. This must happen with the aim of modifying ideas, conceptions, content and practices that, in today's society, no longer make sense for the student, who must be considered as protagonists in the journey of teaching and learning.

School managers, in developing their management practices, have the mission, together with educators, to guarantee constituent elements of innovation. To the extent that it is capable of providing critical reflection on the knowledge constructed by the student, it also allows the social use of this knowledge to be made in a critical, reflective and autonomous way, in the context in which the student is inserted. This way, it will promote a change in attitude, renewal of your pedagogical practice and theoretical-practical reframing of your way of thinking and acting.

These factors open the possibility of tracing and/or defining new paths and, thus, elements emerge that can enhance or weaken the conduct of management and innovative pedagogical practices within the school space.

Just as there are elements that facilitate and even boost school management and pedagogical innovation in the school context, there are several factors that represent challenges for the development of pedagogical innovation. Carbonell, (2002) highlights eight constituent factors for the failure of school management and pedagogical innovation in the educational environment, such as: a) Teachers' resistance and routines; b) Individualism and internal corporatism; c) Pessimism and teacher malaise; d) The perverse effects of reforms; e) The Paradoxes of the double curriculum; f) The saturation and fragmentation of the pedagogical offer; g) Divorce between university research and school practice and h) vertical school management.

Managers and teachers are primarily responsible for school management and pedagogical innovation, but in pedagogical practice they face many adverse situations. The lack of training, teaching, pedagogical and technological material, etc., are some adversities that, in most cases, inhibit initiatives and instigate skepticism regarding the possibility of change.

This way, it is clear that just the desire for change and the commitment of managers and educators are not enough to bring about an imposing change in pedagogical practices,

but a systematic practice of critical reflection on their school management and doing so is necessary. pedagogical as a way of renewing this process. (RAMALHO; NUÑEZ; GAUTHIER, 2014).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The present study, based on a literature review, sought to understand how authors approach themes relating to the relationships between school management and pedagogical innovation, in the context of Basic Education.

Based on the proposed analysis, it can be stated that pedagogical innovation does not occur outside of teachers. It takes place in a planned manner, with defined objectives. It does not happen uncertainly: it leads to improvements in pedagogical practice and changes in teachers' attitudes. It is something common, however, it must happen intentionally, incorporating the new into everyday school life. (CARBONELL, 2002).

School management implies overcoming centralized decision-making processes and experiencing collegial management, in which decision-making arises from collective discussions, involving all segments of the school in a lively, dynamic and integrative pedagogical process. (LÜCK, 2009).

To this end, the study aims to contribute to school management and pedagogical innovation in the context of basic education, boosting the quality of education and meaningful learning; mobilize the dimensions of pedagogical innovation, such as the contribution to teacher training, the pedagogical sustainability of the school, the consolidation of a reflective methodology; encourage the importance of continued training for managers in different areas of school management and pedagogical innovation.

Furthermore, it is important for school management to contribute to the formation of the profile of a research teacher, contributing to the dissemination of pedagogical innovation through the publication of articles in journals and events, thinking about the triad of teaching, research and extension. Finally, contribute to the advancement of discussions, in academic-scientific terms regarding the investigative theme of the research.

REFERENCES

ABRAMOVAY, M. **Escolas inovadoras: experiências bem-sucedidas em escolas públicas.** Brasília, DF: UNESCO, 2003.

BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de conteúdo**. São Paulo: Edições 70, 2011.

CARBONELL, J. **A aventura de inovar**: a mudança na escola. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2002.

DELLORS, J. (Ed). **Educação**: um tesouro a descobrir. Relatório da UNESCO da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI. Rio Tinto/Portugal: Asa- UNESCO, 1996.

FARIAS, I.M.S. **Inovação, mudança e cultura docente**. Brasília, DF: Liber, 2006.

FERNANDES, M. R. **Mudança e inovação na pós-modernidade.** Perspectivas curriculares**.** Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora, 2000.

GARDNER, Howard. **Inteligências Múltiplas**: a Teoria na Prática. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1995.

GIL, Antonio Carlos. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 6. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2019.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; OLIVEIRA, J. F. de; TOSCHI, Mirza Seabra. **Educação escolar**: políticas, estrutura e organização. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003.

LÜCK, Heloísa. **Dimensões de gestão escolar e suas competências**. Curitiba: Editora Positivo, 2009.

LÜCK, Heloísa. **Liderança em gestão escolar**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Vozes, 2011.

OGAWA, Mary N.; FILIPAK, Sirley T. **A formação do gestor escolar**. Curitiba: Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Paraná, 2013. p. 94-108.

RAMALHO, B.L.; NUÑEZ, I. B.; GAUTHIER, C. F**ormar o professor, profissionalizar o ensino–perspectivas e desafios**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.

TORRES, Leonor L.; PALHARES, José A. **Estilos de liderança e escola democrática**. Revista Lusófona de Educação, Lisboa, n. 14, p. 77-99, 2009. Vozes, 2008.