

## Higher education regulation policies and the neglect of pedagogical training of higher education teachers



<https://doi.org/10.56238/chaandieducasc-029>

### Hélio Loiola dos Santos Júnior

PhD student in Education - Postgraduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Pará (PPGED/UFPA).

### Rosinete Silva Macedo

Master's Degree in Science and Environment - Postgraduate Program in Science and Environment at the Federal University of Pará (PPGCMA/UFPA).

### ABSTRACT

This article aims to identify the profile of the higher education teacher in Brazil, directed by the regulatory policies embodied through the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCN) and, especially, the National System for the Evaluation of Higher Education (Sinaes). The research modalities adopted in this study were documentary and bibliographic research. The results obtained reveal

that the regulatory policies of higher education in Brazil, intensified in the second half of the 1990s, began to systematically regulate this level of education in line with neoliberal market principles and, consequently, changed the conception of educational evaluation, which began to be directed towards the control of higher education institutions and, consequently, for the reconfiguration of the profile of the teaching staff of this level of education, which has become strongly characterized by: titration, productivism and restricted domain of the specific contents of specific areas, directed by regulatory policies to the detriment of the development of didactic-pedagogical knowledge, which do not occupy centrality in the concerns of the country's government policies.

**Keywords:** Regulatory policies, Higher education teaching profile, Market demands.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The consolidation of neoliberalism in the last two decades of the twentieth century and its constant search for the implementation of business rationality in all forms of social relations crystallized, in the institutions of the bourgeois state, the mechanisms of regulation and evaluation, both based on a homogenizing, quantifying and controlling perspective.

Institutional evaluation as a regulatory device began to be implemented through the various state reforms of a neoliberal nature, in all areas, including social and education, and was not immune to this process. Thus, it began to perform the function of classifying courses and institutions, focusing on the measurable and standardized results established by prescriptive policies, guided by international organizations and business associations.

In the Brazilian case, neoliberal policies advanced strongly, especially at the beginning of the country's (liberal) redemocratization process, and had their entry point in the ephemeral government of Fenando Collor de Melo (1990-1992) and its deepening and consolidation in the government



administration of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002) and in the governments that followed (VAZ; MERLO, 2020).

With the discourse of confronting the overcoming of the financial crisis of the 1980s that affected all of Latin America, the Brazilian State implemented, from the 1990s onwards, a series of reforms in order to regulate public policies, organs and state instances, according to the new order of capital and the demands of neoliberal society (ROSA *et al.*, 2023).

In this set of reforms, education was eminently targeted by reformist neoliberal policies, especially higher education, since the latter, being reconfigured, according to neoliberal principles, has a primordial role in the training and conformation of the working mass, including teachers of all levels of education; the construction of knowledge that is immediately useful to capital (financial and productive); and the dissemination of neoliberal ideologies that mediate and guide the social relations of the bourgeois order and provide the contribution to the full functioning of capitalist society.

In order to meet these demands, the Brazilian State intensified the model of regulation called, by Santos Filho (2000), the contraction of the State, that is, the regulatory State becomes the expression of neoliberalism in higher education, which is constituted by the reformulation of its functions, as a financier and the only one responsible for the maintenance of (public) higher education. starts to act as a standardizer and monitor of what is established as the role of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and their professors.

From this perspective, the first regulatory frameworks of the neoliberal educational reformist policy were established, namely: Law No. 9,394/1996 (new LDB), which introduced the notion of competency-based training and, subsequently, from 2001 onwards, the first National Curriculum Guidelines (DCN) for undergraduate courses (bachelor's and bachelor's degrees), whose functions consist of directing, in fact regulating, the professional training model within the HEIs and to establish the student and teacher profile, both for bachelor's and bachelor's degrees.

Regulation here is understood as a set of mechanisms that permeates the establishment of verifiable rules, encompassing the procedures and strategies that seek to mold people, the acceptance and subjection to these same rules, thus aiming at the maintenance and harmony of a given system (MAUÉS; MOTA JUNIOR, 2011).

Thus, after the control policies guided by the bias of minimum contents in the 1960s, the agenda of the time is training by competences, conducted especially by the DCN with the help of institutional evaluation instruments, whose purpose is to ascertain, monitor and assess what is being implemented of the regulations established for the training of new workers. demanded by the new social reconfiguration that is more unstable, dynamic and flexible, which implies reconfiguring the teaching profile, given that they are on the front line of the formal training of these new workers.



That said, this article aims to investigate the teaching profile guided by institutional regulatory policies. Its materialization occurred through a systematized study, conducted by bibliographic and documentary researches that contributed to the collection of data, later analyzed under the bias of Bardin's Content Analysis (1977).

Regarding bibliographic research, Severino (2007, p. 122) understands this type of research as the one developed:

[...] From the available record, resulting from previous research, in printed documents, such as books, articles, theses, etc. It uses data or theoretical categories that have already been worked on by other researchers and duly recorded. The texts become sources of the topics to be researched. The researcher works from the contributions of the authors of the analytical studies contained in the texts.

Thus, bibliographic research does not focus on experiments or in search of information or empirical data, whether from document analysis, reports, interviews, etc. As its raw material is already published data, it is necessary to carry out a literature review stage.

In addition, bibliographic research is essential for the collection of historical and epistemological data about a certain universe that encompasses the object of the research. In this case, searching for the duly recorded facts and historical contexts of a given policy is essential to, at least, problematize, reflect and understand, for example, the process of neglect of didactic-pedagogical training in higher education teaching perpetuated throughout liberal and neoliberal education policies (GIL, 2008).

The analysis of data in this type of research must always be rigorous, since the bibliographic research focuses on secondary sources that may have data collected and processed wrongly and to reduce the possibility of repetition of mistakes "it is convenient for researchers to ensure the conditions in which the data were obtained, to analyze each information in depth to discover possible inconsistencies or contradictions and to use different sources, carefully comparing" (GIL, 2008, p. 51).

With regard to documentary research, Evangelista and Shiroma (2019, p. 85) emphasize that the analysis of documents, especially those that deal with public policies for education, must advance beyond the apparent and descriptive aspects, which are manifested at first glance, and should,

[...] deciphering, in the texts, the announced or veiled objectives of a given policy, in order to understand how the bourgeois hegemonic project is articulated or confronted, how they impact the class struggle, how they collaborate or hinder the construction of a sociability that overcomes the capitalist mode of production.

Thus, documentary research, according to the above-mentioned authors, is a fundamental element in the elucidation of data, since it fosters the problematization of the constitutive information of a given policy, in this specific case the policy of regulation of higher education. In addition, it helps



to unveil the directions of this policy and its true political, epistemic and pedagogical purposes; highlighting its impacts and consequences as an integral policy of the ongoing higher education reform.

The data collected were analyzed by the Content Analysis method, as it provides fundamental elements for the coding, categorization and interpretation of the data, through a detailed detail that elucidates in a dialectical way the complexity of the object under study (BARDIN, 1977). These research and analysis techniques together enabled a better understanding of the impact of these policies on higher education teachers.

This article is structured in two parts: The first is the introduction which, in addition to situating the object of the present study, presents the objective and methodological path of the investigation and seeks to problematize the implementation of regulatory evaluation of a neoliberal character in Brazilian higher education. The second addresses the regulatory aspects of the DCN and institutional evaluation in the reconfiguration of higher education teaching.

## 1.1 INSTITUTIONAL REGULATORY ASPECTS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING

The theme of teaching in higher education has gained greater emphasis in the last three decades, and from now on, there has been a relative growth in scientific studies directed to this field, which still needs much elucidation and deepening, especially in a context of intense regulation of higher education and teaching at this level of education (MASSA; TEIXEIRA, 2018; VEIGA, 2011).

The inclusion of this theme in scientific studies was fostered, above all, by the policy of regulatory institutional evaluation, introduced by the neoliberal doctrine in Brazilian HEIs from the 1990s onwards, which highlighted the "quality" of teaching and, consequently, the quality and performance of the teaching staff (VEIGA, 2012). This evaluation policy for undergraduate courses was consolidated in 2004 with the institutionalization of the National System of Evaluation of Higher Education (Sinaes), instituted by Law No. 10,861 of April 14, 2004.

Thus, the last decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century witnessed the beginning of the materialization of the creation of the legal and political conditions for the creation of a National Evaluation System (SNA) at all levels, from basic to higher education, and in graduate studies this evaluation system was consolidated in the 1970s (PAIVA, 2017; NEPHEW, 2003).

Sinaes, conceived and supervised by the State, through departments of the Ministry of Education (MEC), instituted: self-evaluation, which involves, in its scope, the evaluation of teachers by students; the external evaluation of higher education institutions; and the evaluation of the courses and, including the National Student Performance Exam (Enade). The results (concepts) of this evaluation have come to serve as parameters for the performance of the institutions and for the renewal



or non-renewal of the recognition of the courses. In this way, institutional evaluation and state regulation in the scope of Brazilian higher education were effectively consolidated (ROTHEN; BARREYRO, 2010).

With regard to the evaluation of courses, the Sinaes Law emphasizes in article 4 that "The evaluation of undergraduate courses aims to identify the teaching conditions offered to students, especially those related to the profile of the faculty, the physical facilities and the didactic pedagogical organization" (BRASIL, 2004).

In this context, in an analysis of the MEC/Inep document (2017) called "Instrument for the Evaluation of On-site and Distance Undergraduate Courses", it is noted that there is little or no requirement for the didactic-pedagogical training of university professors. Considering that the dimensions of the quality indicators related to teaching pointed out in the document deal only with the evaluation of the organization of the teaching and learning process (organization of the curriculum, methodologies, management and planning) and the didactic and infrastructural conditions of the courses. Only in the indicator referring to distance education does it mention training for tutors.

Therefore, it seems contradictory to evaluate the teaching conditions presented to students without promoting adequate conditions for teaching practice, especially in the function related to teaching, which, in this case, should necessarily include teacher training, considering that the knowledge derived from specific training for teaching is essential for their pedagogical practice.

The aforementioned MEC/Inep document (2017) is a tool used since 2008 by Sinaes, and determines that the evaluation of undergraduate courses must go through three dimensions: 1) didactic-pedagogical organization; 2) faculty and tutorial staff and 3) physical infrastructure. Of which the first two are directly related to the teaching staff (MEC/INEP, 2017).

In the dimension related to the faculty, some points of analysis are highlighted: the first refers to the evaluation of the Structuring Teaching Nucleus (NDE) of the course, of which a mostly quantitative evaluation is carried out related to the work regime and the title of its members, as well as its performance in the monitoring and updating of the Pedagogical Project of the Course - PPC (MEC/INEP, 2017).

However, in the context of the pedagogical training of the members of the NDE, this is not evaluated, such an action would be opportune, since the professors who are part of the composition of this nucleus have the following attributions: the design, continuous monitoring and updating of the PPC of the undergraduate courses (CONAES, 2010). Due to their political-pedagogical character, these attributions require a broad and solid training that involves, in addition to technical competence, pedagogical and political competences, both of which are neglected, both in the training guidelines and in the evaluative and regulatory policies of the Brazilian State (VEIGA, 2012).



Therefore, the possible reflexive/critical weakness of the teaching staff that makes up the NDEs, arising from the lack of theoretical bases of the scientific-pedagogical and political dimension, caused by the lack of critical training and particularly for teaching, can leave this collegiate body (NDE) more vulnerable to external prescriptions, whether methodological, content and/or conceptions (CONTRERAS, 2002). These prescriptions imprint models of pedagogical projects that, in general, do not correspond to the real institutional needs and broad demands of society.

Thus, the lack of a State/institutional training structure that considers the development of pedagogical capacity, nor of politics, weakens the implementation of a collectively and conscious project capable of promoting a professional and human training based on the balance of the tripod teaching, research, extension and the practice/theory unit, and thus compromises the offer of a broad education, which would have the potential to provide a transformative action in the subject/teacher, and consequently in the students and in the social reality (VEIGA, 2016).

Consequently, this situation of an NDE weakened by the absence of a broad and critical education, corroborates the lack of criticality and reflexivity, which can lead to the acceptance without questioning and without broad discussions of training projects articulated within the offices of business associations, government agencies and international organizations, with academic institutions only being responsible for their mere compliance.

It is important to note that the NDE was instituted by Conaes Resolution No. 1 of June 17, 2010, which limited its composition to the teaching category, with at least 60% of the members with *strict sensu training*, and at least 20% of the Full-Time Regime, therefore, the categories of students and administrative technicians were excluded from its composition. This measure demonstrates the exclusionary and authoritarian aspect of this legal provision, which established as one of the attributions of the NDE "To ensure compliance with the National Curriculum Guidelines for Undergraduate Courses" (CONAES, 2010, n. p.). Therefore, what can be inferred is that the veiled role attributed to this collegiate is that of inspector and guarantor of compliance with the prescriptions of regulatory documents.

The second point to highlight in the MEC/Inep document (2017) (Instrument for the Evaluation of On-site and Distance Undergraduate Courses), deals with the evaluation of the coordinators of the undergraduate courses, at this point, qualitative aspects are evaluated such as: the performance of the manager and the relevance of this performance with the pedagogical project of the course; the interaction with the faculty and students; the ability to explore the potential of the faculty, among others. However, at no point is there any mention of the evaluation of the pedagogical training of the course director, who is also a teacher (MASSA; TEIXEIRA, 2018). Since, being a professor and, preferably, a doctor of the Exclusive Dedication or Full-Time Regime are requirements for the function of director of colleges, when referring to public HEIs (PALMEIRAS; SGARI; SZILAGYI, 2015).



Therefore, this director/coordinator deals directly and indirectly with the teaching and learning process, both in the internal environment of the classroom and in the broad context of the course management, thus requiring a broad training that involves both the knowledge related to management and the knowledge related to research and teaching activities, which in the case of the latter is simply neglected by state policies. whether these are training or evaluation policies (PALMEIRAS; SGARI; SZILAGYI, 2015).

With regard to the third and last point of analysis in the MEC/Inep Document: Instrument for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Courses (2017), in this case, the evaluation of the professor, the situation is not very different, the following are evaluated: the academic title, the work regime; professional experience outside of teaching and professional teaching experience. Likewise, no traces or notes were found in this document referring to initial and/or continuing pedagogical training, nor in relation to the requirement to implement an innovative teaching and learning performance based on the balance and integrality of teaching, research and extension as a parameter for academic quality (MASSA; TEIXEIRA, 2018).

The emphasis on the title and professional experience without the requirement of pedagogical training leads to a deficient performance of pedagogical practice which, in turn, does not dispense with the mastery of specific teaching knowledge, which in addition to knowledge of specific content, encompasses knowledge of the teaching and learning process; the ability to interact with students; ability to turn specific content into teachable content; knowledge of various teaching methods and techniques, among others, with a view to better student learning (MASETTO, 2009; VALENTINE; SILVA, 2020).

In this context, there is a close alignment of the instruments of evaluation of higher education with the training policies of the National Graduate System and, although this presents graduate studies as a space for the training of researchers and professors for higher education, it is evident the preference and privilege that is given to the training of researchers in a way that is disconnected from the non-existent pedagogical training. both in training actions and in internal and external evaluation actions that prioritize degrees, experience and scientific production to the detriment of training actions inherent to pedagogical science, which is so necessary for the construction of teaching knowledge and the teaching and learning process (CUNHA, 2009; ZABALZA, 2004).

From the implementation of the evaluation of a regulatory nature with a focus on results, the teacher, and his pedagogical practice, became the target of greater attention, monitoring and institutional control, including the responsibility for the success or failure of the student's performance. This performance began to be measured by Enade and to occupy a central place from 2008 onwards,



with the creation of the Preliminary Course Concept – CPC, <sup>1</sup>as a preponderant instrument in the supervision and regulation of higher education, whose greatest weight is on the performance of students and on the teaching title (ROTHEN; NASCIUTTI, 2011). While in a contradictory way, institutional pedagogical training, which should be guaranteed and promoted by the State, continues to be neglected, even in its purely technical line (VEIGA, 2016).

Article 5 of the Sinaes Law states that Enade:

§ 1 [...] will assess the performance of students in relation to the syllabus provided for in the curricular guidelines of the respective undergraduate course, their abilities to adjust to the demands arising from the evolution of knowledge and their competences to understand topics outside the specific scope of their profession, linked to the Brazilian and world reality and to other areas of knowledge (BRASIL, 2004, n. p.).

Thus, the direction of pre-conceived contents and pre-determined competencies by the DCN of the courses, which in the neoliberal State takes place under the guidance of organizations/associations/movements that represent the business sector, also shape the "training" and consequently the teaching practice, given that their own training (recruitment) comes to be governed by the same logic of training for the development of predetermined competencies in a movement generally from the outside in. that is, from the market to schools/universities. As can be seen in Chart 1, below:

Table 1 - DCN of some bachelor's degree courses and teacher training

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>TEACHER TRAINING/QUALIFICATION</b>	
Administration	DCN/2005 - does not mention teacher qualification.	DCN/2021 (Resolution No. 5/2021) - Proposes that the course should maintain a permanent continuing teacher training program aligned with the development of the competencies defined in the Pedagogical Project.
Engineering	DCN/2002 - does not mention teacher qualification.	DCN/2019 (Resolution No. 2/2019) - Provides for a Permanent Training and Development Program for its teaching staff, with a view to valuing the teaching activity and developing the skills defined in the Pedagogical Project.
<b>COURSE</b>	<b>TEACHER TRAINING/QUALIFICATION</b>	
Medicine	DCN/2001 - does not mention teacher qualification.	DCN/2014 (Resolution No. 3/2014) - Establishes a program for the training and development of health teaching aimed at the greater involvement of teachers with the Pedagogical Project of the Course.
Pharmacy	DCN/2002 - does not mention teacher qualification.	DCN/2017 (Resolution No. 6/2017) - Establishes permanent teacher qualification and training, with the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and the collective construction of the social function of teachers.

Source: The authors themselves from the DCN of the administration, engineering, medicine and pharmacy courses (2023).

<sup>1</sup> CPC is an indicator for the classification of courses, whose concept ranges from 1 to 5, consisting of: i) Enade result and indicator of difference between expected and observed performance (IDD); ii) faculty qualifications; iii) teaching work regime; and iv) students' perception/opinion about the infrastructure and pedagogical project of the course. Courses with CPC 3 or 4 are considered satisfactory and exempt from the *on-site* visit to have their recognitions authorized. CPC 5 courses are considered "reference" courses.





The first versions of the DCN of the bachelor's degree courses did not mention the need for teacher training/qualification. However, courses in this area (bachelor's degrees) have been tending to include teacher training in their curricula. This situation is fostered from the latest versions of the DCN of these courses, which began to point out the need to offer this training, with the exception that it must be carried out through permanent programs offered by the HEIs themselves, and must be directly related to the enhancement of the materialization of the competencies established by the PPC of the courses which, in turn, they must be aligned with the competencies determined by the DCN of the respective courses.

The new DCN show remnants of a certain concern with pedagogical training for teachers working in undergraduate courses. However, they delegate this responsibility to the HEIs. In this way, the State continues to exempt itself from this responsibility for teacher training, even in a pragmatic bias, as pointed out by the DCN and passes it on to the HEIs. Thus, the pedagogical training of higher education teachers is not a State policy, becoming more of a policy restricted to the HEIs themselves, without the specific allocation of financial resources by the State for this purpose, which makes it impossible for it to be effectively materialized on a continuous basis (VEIGA, 2016).

If, on the one hand, the DCN fosters a certain "autonomy" over the direction of training, on the other hand, it limits it, due to the restriction of financial resources and infrastructure necessary to carry out this training action, in addition to the indication that this training is linked to the competencies prescribed to undergraduate graduates.

From this perspective, Resolution No. 2, of April 24, 2019, when instituting the new DCN of Undergraduate Engineering courses in art.14 § 1, emphasizes:

The undergraduate course in Engineering must maintain a permanent Training and Development Program for its faculty, with a view to valuing the teaching activity, the greater involvement of teachers with the Pedagogical Project of the Course [...] so that they assume a greater commitment to the development of the desired competencies in the graduates. [...]

§ 2 The institution must define indicators for the evaluation and appreciation of the teaching work in the activities developed in the course (CNE, 2019, p. 6).

As the conception, organization and monitoring of the PPC are the responsibilities of the NDE, as already seen, the continuing teacher training (provided for in the PPC) is another challenge to this faculty collegiate, which in the case of engineering courses, as well as in other bachelor's degree courses, its members (professors) are not trained for teaching, and have not had undergraduate and graduate training in their training. With rare exceptions, the development of the pedagogical dimension, and now they are faced with the challenge of conceiving, in addition to the project of training undergraduate students, of also conceiving the program of permanent training of teachers at this level.



Because the State is absent from its role of instituting and promoting national policies for teacher training for undergraduate courses, delegating to the HEIs (the colleges) the obligation to qualify their teachers through continuous institutional training programs, after entering the institution and in full exercise of their functions – without pointing out sources of resources or the conditions for their realization – training that the DCN are emphatic in restricting the relationship with the restricted competencies demanded for graduates, that is, based on a totally pragmatic/utilitarian bias (PEIXOTO, 2021; SANTOS JÚNIOR, 2022).

Thus, the bourgeois state abdicates its role of promoting the conditions of education, but not of the content and purpose of this training, which is demanded by the competencies required in the national guidelines, and assumes "[...] A role of paramount importance is to define the objectives of the education system and the curriculum to be adopted. The other role of this post-bureaucratic state would be to 'govern by results' (MAUÉS; MOTA JUNIOR, 2011, p. 390). For which evaluation is used as a monitoring and control tool.

With regard to the duty of HEIs to define evaluation indicators (internal evaluation) and a policy for valuing the teaching work. This is an obvious obligation, because evaluation as a democratic and formative process must come from the institution itself, in order to constantly seek to know its concrete reality in order to correct its flaws, it would be the "moment when institutions have greater possibilities to present their considerations and carry out a more collective construction of their actions and reflections" (MENEZES, 2012, p. 82), both in terms of its institutional training organization and its teaching and research practices, among others (RASCO, 2000).

However, due to the fact that the results of the internal evaluation do not have weight in the CPC, which is generated by the external evaluation of a regulatory nature, the HEIs end up submitting to the guidelines governed by the external evaluation and its dictates. With regard to policies for valuing teaching work, the situation is no different, as external evaluation values the degree (without the need for pedagogical training), scientific research and academic production – without the need for production in the pedagogical area – therefore, the policies of the HEIs also tend to this alignment (VEIGA *et al.*, 2008; ZABALZA, 2004).

Such a situation, driven by the implementation of neoliberal principles, arising from the constant transformations within bourgeois society, has increasingly made formal education an instrument for the reproduction of the conditions of capitalist production, and for the subordination of labor to capital.

Such rationality adopted with greater intensity, in the Brazilian case, dating from the second half of the 1990s through the neoliberal State, which, following an international trend, assumed new functions from the Administrative/Managerial Reform of 1995, which aimed to constitute a managerial public administration and the consolidation of a regulatory and evaluating State.



According to Barroso (2005), regulation is a somewhat polysemic, plural and diverse concept, which, depending on the area, can take on different meanings and positions. With regard to the way in which education systems are coordinated, "The regulatory process includes not only the production of rules [...] that guide the functioning of the system, but also the (re)adjustment of the diversity of actions of the actors according to these same rules" (BARROSO, 2005, p. 733).

In this way, regulation has a double objective, the first consists in standardizing, that is, establishing the norms that would provide the balance and proper functioning of a given system, and the second consists in shaping the subjectivities of the subjects, so that they submit to the rules of the game of capital. As not all actors passively submit to these rules, sanctions are imposed as a measure of repression and reordering of the game. In this way, the regulatory instruments are conceived as a form of control and monitoring, to verify if, in fact, the rules have been and/or are being complied with, and their results promote awards or punishments to HEIs and teachers, who end up becoming hostages of the regulatory policies promoted by the regulatory State.

Therefore, in the face of the new demands arising from the neoliberal system and the minimum standards of "quality" constituted by it, it is that from the 1990s and 2000s, the institutional evaluation policies of a regulatory nature were established, having as reference the DCN, and the competencies demanded by it, which directly interfere in the training of the undergraduate. and the teacher, who is also directly responsible for the student's good performance.

The results of this control and regulation (evaluation) device have revealed that this quality standard has not been achieved (VEIGA, 2012), especially in peripheral countries such as Brazil, a situation that places the responsibility for students' lack of learning about teachers, their training and performance, thus guiding a pragmatic and light education. and a performance that is also pragmatic and regulated, based on an idea of quality directed and restricted to some pre-established competencies and skills, with no nexus to the sense of quality in its broad and socially referenced approach.

In this domain, an expanded training for teaching in higher education, which has historically been neglected by the Brazilian capitalist state, does not see any perspective or tendency to be contemplated in the legal devices and norms of the new neoliberal logic that, in turn, subordinates the curriculum; scientific-technological production; and the training to the logic of the market, and highlights in the graduate program a utilitarian and productivist training that favors the technical-scientific field useful to companies, whether in the industrial and/or service sectors, to the detriment of an integral education, which involves in its composition the dimensions: scientific, technological, political and pedagogical, the latter so necessary to the teaching and learning process in the undergraduate program.



## 2 FINAL THOUGHTS

The capitalist project of the neoliberal managerialist state has expanded vertiginously in all spaces and ideological apparatuses of the Brazilian state, especially in the educational sector through the implementation of regulatory policies of a market and economic nature.

As a result of the profound changes in the functions of the State as a political entity, provider and executor of social policies, it became a policy manager, assuming the role of regulator and evaluator of the policies demanded by the market, especially in the areas of education and teacher training for the levels of education.

From this perspective, the prescriptive documents of the higher education policy postulate, in general terms, an education in undergraduate courses based on a market logic that privileges the business principles of overvaluing the development of skills aimed at a technical professional performance. Pointing out to the teachers the execution of teaching techniques, such as active methodologies that focus on the principle of learning by doing, based on the pedagogies of learning to learn and on their basic values of capitalist pragmatism. It was noticed that these principles are the basis of the training of teachers of bachelor's degree courses, since, in general, this technical training is the only one that these teachers had access to.

Regarding the external institutional evaluation, it was found that there are no indicators of quality of evaluation related to pedagogical training, but good results are required in the teaching and learning process; It points out quality indicators for infrastructure and the performance of the teaching staff, without effectively providing the necessary support for teacher training and pedagogical practice.

What is perceptible is the intention of delegating the success and failure of teaching to the private and non-public, individual and non-collective spheres and, above all, to attribute the problems arising from the neglect of structural resources from teaching to the teaching performance, that is, to transfer the responsibility for deficient teaching to teachers.

The study also points out that in the neoliberal policy of higher education, institutional evaluation tends to assume a meticulous function of measuring what is being implemented from the regulatory frameworks of the managerial State to the HEIs with regard to the contents, behaviors, values and principles of the bourgeois neoliberal society, that is, a mechanism of control of the bourgeois State over the HEI, and on teacher training and practice.

Therefore, the alternative of new social and economic parameters for educational policy, especially for higher education, has never been more necessary, in view of the adoption of paradigms that overcome the bourgeois hegemony of education in the policy of regulation, in order to postulate an effectively democratic process of teaching and institutional evaluation in which HEIs resist the corporate attacks of evaluation as a control device.



To this end, it is necessary that HEIs and academic associations vehemently oppose the current arbitrary model of institutional evaluation and outline strategies and processes of self-evaluation that involves, in fact, all segments of the academic community (students, professors, administrative technicians) in a permanent and collective process of discussions and debates around the problems, challenges and possibilities. with a view to improving the education offered and promoting a participatory academic space, aware of its social and transformative role.



## REFERENCES

BARDIN, Laurence. *Análise de conteúdo*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1977.

BARROSO, João. O Estado, a educação e a regulação das políticas públicas. *Educ. Soc.*, Campinas, vol. 26, n. 92, p. 725-751, Especial - Out. 2005. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/TVLjsSNcwyChwwYkxtGX7YD/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Acesso em: 10 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. Lei nº 10.861, de 14 de abril de 2004. Institui o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior (SINAES) e dá outras providências. Brasília: Presidência da República, [2004]. Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_ato2004-2006/2004/lei/110.861.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2004-2006/2004/lei/110.861.htm). Acesso em: 23 fev. 2022.

CONAES. Conselho Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior. Resolução nº 1, de 17 de junho de 2010. Normatiza o núcleo docente estruturante e dá outras providências. Brasília: Conaes, [2010]. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=6885-resolucao1-2010-conae&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=6885-resolucao1-2010-conae&Itemid=30192). Acesso em: 02 jan. 2021.

CNE. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução nº 2, de 24 de abril de 2019. Institui as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais do Curso de Graduação em Engenharia. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Brasília, Seção 1, p. 43 e 44, 26 abr. 2019. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=112681-rces002-19&category\\_slug=abril-2019-pdf&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=112681-rces002-19&category_slug=abril-2019-pdf&Itemid=30192). Acesso em: 01 out. 2021.

CONTRERAS, José. *A autonomia de professores*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.

CUNHA, Maria Isabel da. O lugar da formação do professor universitário: o espaço da pós-graduação em educação em questão. *Rev. Diálogo Educ.*, Curitiba, v. 9, n. 26, p. 81-90, jan./abr. 2009. Disponível em: [http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci\\_abstract&pid=S1981-416X2009000100006&lng=pt&nrm=iso](http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S1981-416X2009000100006&lng=pt&nrm=iso). Acesso em: 14 dez. 2022.

SANTOS FILHO, José Camilo. Análise teórico-política do Exame Nacional de Cursos. *In: SOBRINHO, José Dias; RISTOF, Dilvo I. (Orgs.). Universidade Desconstruída: Avaliação Institucional e Resistência*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2000. p. 149-179.

GIL, Antônio Carlos. *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.

MASETTO, Marcos Tarciso. Formação pedagógica dos docentes do ensino superior. *Revista Brasileira de Docência, Ensino e Pesquisa em Administração*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 04-25, julho/2009. Disponível em: [https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4288032/mod\\_resource/content/1/FORMACAO\\_PEDAGOGICA\\_DOCENTES\\_DO\\_ENSINO\\_SUPERIOR\\_MASETTO.pdf](https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4288032/mod_resource/content/1/FORMACAO_PEDAGOGICA_DOCENTES_DO_ENSINO_SUPERIOR_MASETTO.pdf). Acesso em: 13 jun. 2022.

MASSA, Monica de Souza; TEIXEIRA, Cristina Maria D'Avila. A formação didática do docente universitário. *Rev. Educ. Perspec.*, Viçosa, v. 9, n. 2, p. 230-240, maio/ago. 2018. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufv.br/educacaoemperspectiva/article/view/7019/2847>. Acesso em: 20 jan. 2023.

MAUÉS, Olgaíses Cabral; MOTA JUNIOR, William Pessoa da. A nova regulação educacional e o trabalho docente na pós-graduação brasileira. *Linhas Críticas*, Brasília, v. 17, n. 33, p. 385-402, maio/ago. 2011. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/linhascriticas/article/view/3817/3490>. Acesso em: 12 mar. 2022.



MEC/INEP. Ministério da Educação. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. Instrumento de Avaliação de cursos de graduação Presencial e a distância: Reconhecimento Renovação de Reconhecimento. Brasília: MEC/Inep, [2017]. Disponível em [https://download.inep.gov.br/educacao\\_superior/avaliacao\\_cursos\\_graduacao/instrumentos/2017/curso\\_reconhecimento.pdf](https://download.inep.gov.br/educacao_superior/avaliacao_cursos_graduacao/instrumentos/2017/curso_reconhecimento.pdf). Acesso em: 2 fev. 2022.

MENEZES, Ângela Maria de. Autoavaliação como instrumento de Gestão na Educação Superior: o caso do Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de Goiás – IFG. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2012. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.unb.br/handle/10482/12342>. Acesso em: 14 jan. 2023.

PAIVA, Liz Denize Carvalho. Autoavaliação institucional na educação superior. *In*: Stella Cecília Duarte Segenreich (Org.). Organização institucional e acadêmica na expansão da educação superior: glossário. Rio de Janeiro: Publit, 2017. p. 167-171.

PALMEIRAS, Jenifer de Brum; SGARI, Rosani; SZILAGYI, Carlos Leonardo. A influencia do gestor na gestão da formação do professor universitário na percepção de gestores/diretores de uma universidade do norte do Estado do RS. *In*: FÁVERO, Altair Alberto; TONIETO, Carina; ODY, Leandro Carlos (Orgs.). Docência universitária: pressupostos teóricos e perspectivas didáticas. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2015. p. 247-278.

RASCO, José. Félix Ângulo. A auto-avaliação institucional como processo de formação do professorado. *In*: DIAS SOBRINHO, José; RISTOFF, Dilvo I. Universidade desconstruída: avaliação institucional e resistência. Florianópolis: Insular, 2000. p. 73-94.

ROSA, Giovanna Kambetunava *et al.* A atuação dos aparelhos privados de hegemonia do empresariado e dos seus intelectuais orgânicos no processo de elaboração da BNC - formação inicial. *Colloquium Humanarum*, v. 20, p. 1-22 jan/dez 2023. Disponível em: <https://journal.unoeste.br/index.php/ch/article/view/4655/3556>. Acesso em: 27 jun. 2023.

ROTHEN, José Carlos; BARREYRO, Gladys Beatriz. Expansão da educação superior no Brasil e avaliação institucional: um estudo do Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior (SINAES) na “Revista Avaliação”. *Série-Estudos - Periódico do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da UCDB*, Campo Grande, n. 30, p. 167-181, jul./dez. 2010. Disponível em: <http://each.uspnet.usp.br/gladysb/expansao.pdf>. Acesso em 8 mar. 2023.

ROTHEN, José Carlos; NASCIUTTI, Fernanda. A educação superior em prova: o perfil da educação superior apresentado pelos resultados do ENADE 2005 e 2006. *Rev. Diálogo Educ.*, Curitiba, v. 11, n. 32, p. 187-206, jan./abr. 2011. Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1891/189118887011.pdf>. Acesso em: 2 jul. 2022.

SEVERINO, Antônio Joaquim. Metodologia do trabalho científico. 23. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2007.  
SANTOS JÚNIOR, Hélio Loiola dos. O ensino nos cursos superiores de engenharias: concepções, perspectivas e desafios. *Revista Educação e Emancipação*, São Luís, v. 15, n. 2, maio/ago. 2022. Disponível em: <https://cajapio.ufma.br/index.php/reducacaoemancipacao/article/view/20388>. Acesso em: 30 jan. 2023.

SOBRINHO, José Dias. Avaliação: políticas educacionais e reformas da educação superior. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003.

VAZ, Vinícius Rezende Carretoni; MERLO, Edgard Monforte. O Consenso de Washington no Brasil: estabilização conservadora e estagnação. *Aurora*, Marília, v.13, n. 1, p. 37-58, jan./jun., 2020.



Disponível em: <https://revistas.marilia.unesp.br/index.php/aurora/article/view/10334>. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2023.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro *et al.* Docência universitária: formação pedagógica no âmbito da pós-graduação. *Linhas Críticas*, v. 14, n. 26, p. 61-77, enero-junio 2008. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/linhascriticas/article/view/3427/3115>. Acesso em: 10 jan. 2023.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro. A docência na Educação Superior e as didáticas especiais: campos em construção. *Educação, Santa Maria*. v. 36, n. 3, p. 455-464, set./dez. 2011. Disponível: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/reeducacao/article/view/2977>. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2023.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro. *A aventura de formar professores*. 2. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 2012.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro. *Educação superior: políticas educacionais, currículo e docência*. Curitiba: CRV, 2016.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro; SILVA, Edileuza Fernandes. Para onde vão a didática geral da educação superior e as didáticas específicas? *In: VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro; FERNANDES, Rosana Cesar de Arruda. Por uma didática da educação superior*. Campinas: Autores associados, 2020. p. 41-60.

ZABALZA, Miguel A. *O ensino universitário: seu cenário e seus protagonistas*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004.