

Evaluation of higher education in the São Paulo state system: Articulations between CEE/SP and Unesp/São José do Rio Preto

Avaliação da educação superior no sistema estadual paulista: Articulações entre o CEE/SP e Unesp/São José do Rio Preto

Evaluación de la enseñanza superior en el sistema paulista: Articulaciones entre CEE/SP y Unesp/São José do Rio Preto

Maria Eliza Nogueira Oliveira¹ , Regilson Maciel Borges² , Joelma dos Santos Bernardes³ 

¹ Federal University of Alfenas, Alfenas, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

² Federal University of Lavras, Lavras, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

³ Municipal Secretary of Education, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

Corresponding author:

Maria Eliza Nogueira Oliveira

Email: mariaeliza_oliveira@yahoo.com.br

How to cite: Oliveira, M. E. N., Borges, R. M., & Bernardes, J. S. (2023). Evaluation of higher education in the São Paulo state system: Articulations between CEE/SP and Unesp/São José do Rio Preto. *Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação*, 16(35), e18811. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v16i35.18811>

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the evaluation processes carried out by the São Paulo State University "Júlio de Mesquita Filho" (UNESP), São José do Rio Preto campus and its relationship with the guidelines formulated within the São Paulo State Education Council (CEE/SP). This is documental research based on deliberations and opinions issued by CEE/SP, as well as on the Institutional Development Plans (PDI) and the five-year Institutional Evaluation Reports produced by UNESP/São José do Rio Preto. The analysis considered the cycles of the Institutional Evaluation of UNESP, which began in 2000, with the last report released in 2019. The collection for the evaluation and regulation gathers data from the undergraduate assessment, considering the Enade; the evaluation of Graduate Studies coordinated by Capes; the institutional evaluation of research, from all the evaluative and regulatory processes developed by the Institution; the institutional evaluation of the extension, according to the parameter of the National Policy of University Extension (PNEU); and the management, whose data reveal that the process is anchored in the management perspective, aiming at the best allocation of budget, financial and human resources in the HEI. The results show that UNESP follows the directives in the CEE/SP deliberations about the evaluation and regulation processes for HEIs. UNESP has a robust system integrated and interconnected with the various academic sectors, whose purpose is to collect institutional data from the different assessment processes that feed back into the Institution's general regulation system.

Keywords: Evaluation and Regulation. Higher Education. State Board of Education. UNESP.

RESUMO

O artigo analisa os processos de avaliação realizados pela Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho” (UNESP), campus São José do Rio Preto, e sua relação com as diretrizes formuladas no âmbito do Conselho Estadual de Educação de São Paulo (CEE/SP). Trata-se de uma pesquisa documental com base em deliberações e pareceres emitidos pelo CEE/SP, assim como nos Planos de Desenvolvimento Institucional (PDI) e nos Relatórios de Avaliação Institucional quinquenais produzidos pela UNESP/São José do Rio Preto. A análise considerou os ciclos da Avaliação Institucional da UNESP, iniciado no ano de 2000, sendo o último relatório divulgado em 2019. A coleta para a avaliação e a regulação reúne dados da avaliação da graduação, considerando o Enade; da avaliação da Pós-Graduação coordenada pela Capes; da avaliação institucional da pesquisa, a partir de todos os processos avaliativos e regulatórios desenvolvidos pela instituição; da avaliação institucional da extensão, conforme parâmetro da Política Nacional de Extensão Universitária (PNEU); e da gestão, cujos dados revelam que o processo se ancora na perspectiva do gerenciamento, visando a melhor alocação do orçamento, e dos recursos financeiro e humano na IES. Os resultados demonstram que a UNESP segue as diretrizes presentes nas deliberações do CEE/SP, no que se refere aos processos de avaliação e regulação para as IES. A UNESP é dotada de um robusto sistema integrado e interligado com os diversos setores acadêmicos, cuja finalidade é coletar dados institucionais dos diferentes processos de avaliação que retroalimentam o sistema geral de regulação da Instituição.

Palavras-chave: Avaliação e Regulação. Educação Superior. Conselho Estadual de Educação. UNESP.

RESUMEN

El artículo analiza los procesos de evaluación realizados por la Universidad del Estado de São Paulo "Júlio de Mesquita Filho" (UNESP), campus São José do Rio Preto, y su relación con las directrices formuladas en el Consejo de Educación del Estado de São Paulo (CEE/SP). Se trata de una investigación documental basada en las deliberaciones y dictámenes emitidos por el CEE/SP, así como en los Planes de Desarrollo Institucional (PDI) y en los Informes de Evaluación Institucional quinquenales elaborados por la UNESP/São José do Rio Preto. El análisis consideró los ciclos de Evaluación Institucional de la UNESP, iniciados en 2000, siendo el último informe divulgado en 2019. El acervo para la evaluación y reglamentación reúne datos de la evaluación de la graduación, considerando el Enade; la evaluación de los Estudios de Posgrado coordinados por Capes; la evaluación institucional de la investigación, a partir de todos los procesos evaluativos y reglamentarios desarrollados por la institución; la evaluación institucional de la extensión, de acuerdo con el parámetro de la Política Nacional de Extensión Universitaria (PNEU); y la gestión, cuyos datos revelan que el proceso está anclado en la perspectiva de la gestión, visando la mejor asignación del presupuesto y de los recursos financieros y humanos en la IES. Los resultados demuestran que la UNESP sigue las directrices presentes en las deliberaciones CEE/SP en cuanto a los procesos de evaluación y regulación de las IES. La UNESP cuenta con un sólido sistema integrado e interconectado con los diversos sectores académicos, cuya finalidad es recoger datos institucionales de los diferentes procesos de evaluación que retro alimentan el sistema de regulación general de la Institución.

Palabras clave: Evaluación y regulación. Educación Superior. Consejo Estatal de Educación. UNESP.

INTRODUCTION

This paper analyzes the role of the São Paulo State Council of Education (CEE/SP) 's role in evaluating and regulating Higher Education. The data derived from the research “Performance of State Education Councils in the evaluation and regulation policies of higher education and their

shaping influences¹ on state public universities” developed by a group of fourteen researchers with the financial support of CNPq (Edital Universal MCTIC/CNPq 2018).

In the current context, where educational systems have used the evaluation policies as an instrument for the regulation of educational institutions at their different levels, the state systems have been articulated to outline and execute their regulatory policies due to the possible adherence to the evaluation processes instituted at the federal level, by the current National System for Higher Education Evaluation (SINAES). In addition, the progressive adherence of State Higher Education Institutions (IESE) to the federal system, already observed in our research (Brandalise, Borges, Oliveira, & Silva, 2022), generates new questions about the performance of state systems, through their Councils, in the regulation of IESE and other jurisdictional HEIs.

In this sense, using the documental research method (Lüdke & André, 1986), the present article analyzes the evaluation processes carried out by the São Paulo State University “Júlio de Mesquita Filho” (UNESP) - taking as reference the São José do Rio Preto campus - about the guidelines formulated in the scope of the São Paulo State Council of Education.

The article is organized into five sections, the first of which is a contextual introduction. In the second section, we present the methodological procedures based on the document research. In the third section, we describe the creation process, the historical mark, and the administrative organization of the CEE/SP based on its deliberations. Finally, in the fifth section, we make brief considerations based on the results achieved.

METODOLOGIA E PROCEDIMENTOS DE COLETA DOS DADOS

The documentary research enabled us to identify the guiding descriptors of the assessment and regulation policy of higher education in São Paulo, which subsidized the investigation process, expanding our understanding of the historical evolution of this policy and its implications for the Unesp of São José do Rio Preto, chosen as the locus of the study (Chizzotti, 2006; Lüdke & André, 1986). After this stage, we took as reference the assumptions of Bardin's Content Analysis (1995), which considers the following phases: 1) pre-analysis, 2) exploration of the material, and 3) interpretation.

The documents referring to CEE/SP were collected initially on the site Laboratório Interdisciplinar de Tecnologias Educacionais FE at Unicamp. In the “pre-analysis” phase, in which the descriptors “Regulation”, “Evaluation”, “Higher Education,” and “Higher Education” were applied, we identified a total of five deliberations by CEE/SP concerning the assessment and regulatory processes carried out in the period from 1997 to 2000. Faced with the need to deepen the data surveyed, we started a new collection on the site of the CEE/SP. The deliberations published by the Council from 2004 to 2018 were selected, totaling 36 deliberations, of which 15 were revoked, considered the twenty-one deliberations in force for the analysis.

The reading of the CEE/SP deliberations allowed the organization of a chart containing the following items: 1) text identification; 2) regulation and evaluation; 3) accreditation and reaccreditation, course authorization, and course recognition; 4) course renewal and supervision; 5) references. In addition, the chart allowed the interpretation of the data through thematic categories that portray the discussion present in the analyzed documents.

In the second stage of the “pre-analysis”, we surveyed the documents published on the website of Unesp/Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas (IBILCE/Unesp Rio Preto). In addition to the resolutions that regulate the institutional assessment process, we carried out a

¹ The researchers work in universities and education networks located in different regions of the country (Municipal Education Network of Uberlândia - PMU, Federal University of São Paulo - UNIFESP, State University of Ponta Grossa - UEPG, State University of Maranhão - UEMA, Federal University of Lavras - UFLA, and Federal University of Alfenas - UNIFAL).

complete reading of the Institutional Development Plans (PDI) of 2009 (Unesp, 2009) and 2016 (Unesp, 2016) and the following institutional assessment reports: Institutional Assessment Report 2005-2009; Institutional Assessment Report 2010-2014; Institutional Assessment Report 2015-2019.

In the analysis of the documents, we took on the investigative challenge of establishing relationships between the reports in the different periods that encompass the time frame of the research (2004-2019). Unesp - a multicampi² university - carried out three five-year evaluation cycles. In the first evaluation cycle (2005-2009), only the partial reports of more than thirty schools prepared by the Local Evaluation Groups (GRAL) were available. In addition, the IBILCE/Rio Preto report was selected for the study. In the two subsequent evaluation cycles (2010-2014 and 2015-2019), the general reports prepared by the Institutional Evaluation Group (GRAI) were made available.

In compliance with the Deliberation of CEE, No. 004/2000, the Institutional Assessment of Unesp is conducted by the Permanent Evaluation Commission (CPA). It is worth mentioning that before the Deliberation of the CEE, Unesp had already regulated the activities of the CPA using Unesp Resolution no. 84 of November 04, 1999. According to the referred Resolution, the CPA acts as an advisory commission to the Rector and is subdivided into two groups: the Faculty Evaluation Group (GRAD), which monitors teaching activities, and the Institutional Evaluation Group (GRAI), whose main function is to plan, coordinate and improve the institutional evaluation process (Unesp, 1999).

The GRAD follows up on the teaching staff activities at the University, analyzing the final reports of the probationary stage, the initial reports for applying the work regime, and the teachers' triennial reports, among other issues pertinent to this category, such as requests for leave of absence. Aiming to improve the faculty evaluation, observing the legislation that provides for the different working regimes at Unesp, GRAD seeks faculty member improvement and the adequacy of their activities to fulfill the institutional mission.

According to the data collected, the GRALs are established by the congregations of the academic units and act as advisory bodies, whose functions are: a) coordinate, articulate, and implement the assessment processes within each unit; b) constitute a mediating link between the CPA and the Advisory Commissions, the Course Councils and the Congregation of the Unit. The results of the local evaluations, substantiated in reports, must provide subsidies to the external evaluators in diagnosing the quality of the academic work, enabling the revision of the policies, programs, and institutional projects that include the evaluation process. However, the absence of local reports formulated by GRAL/IBILCE in the last two evaluation processes suggests changes in the institutional evaluation system that should be investigated in the empirical study phase, whose data will not be presented in this article because it is still under development.

So far, we found that the methodology used for the development of institutional assessment at Unesp is based on the actions of the Institutional Researcher - a technical advisor who makes up the technical team of the Pro-Rector of Undergraduate Studies at Unesp - who requests the Undergraduate Technical Section and the Graduate Technical Section of each unit to provide complementary data for the preparation of institutional assessment reports produced by the CPA.

The next sections will present the next stages of Content Analysis - an exploration of the material and interpretation - of the documents from CEE/SP and Unesp/IBILCE.

² Created in 1976 from isolated institutes of higher education that existed in various regions of the state of São Paulo, Unesp has 34 units in 24 cities, 22 of which are in the Interior; in the State Capital, São Paulo; and the São Paulo coast, in São Vicente. Retrieved from <https://www2.unesp.br/portal#!/unesp-40-anos/perfil-da-universidade/>

CEE-SP AND THE EVALUATION AND REGULATION PROCESSES OF THE IES PAULISTAS: FROM HISTORY TO COMPOSITION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The creation of CEE/SP was made through State Law no. 7. 940 of July 7, 1963, and its administrative organization was regulated by Law no. 10.403 of July 6, 1971, resulting in the approval of its regulation (Decree no. 52.811 of October 6, 1971) (São Paulo, 1971a, 1971b; Garrossino, 2007).

Constituted by the Basic Education Chamber and the Higher Education Chamber, the CEE/SP currently comprises 24 members appointed by the Governor, "chosen among people of notorious knowledge and experience in matters of education". Each of the Chambers has a president, a vice-president, and its Counselors, not being allowed to be part of more than one Chamber. The Council has permanent and special commissions, especially the Planning Commission and the Legislation and Norms Commission, each with a president, a vice-president, and at least three members appointed by the Council President. In addition, the Planning Commission and its members must represent each Council Chambers.

Each Chamber has the autonomy to elect its president and vice-president, with the incumbents having one-year terms with the possibility of re-election. The electoral process is carried out by secret ballot by an absolute majority of the Councilors in the first voting. The remaining votes are by simple majority. It is worth mentioning that the inauguration occurs in the same session after the electoral result.

In compliance with Law No. 10,403/71 and Decree No. 9,887/77, the attributions of the Chambers, as well as of the Council and the Presidency, are advised by the Legislation and Standards and Planning Commissions. The functions of the Chambers include the analysis of subjects in their respective areas of expertise, except for those that need to be discussed by the Plenary of CEE/SP, such as the preparation of proposals for rules related to the application of education laws and the organization of work plans and projects focused on education problems. Based on the legislation, the Boards issue opinions and indications to be appreciated in the plenary session of a simple majority of the Council, which deliberates (edition of new norm, modification of the existing one, or revocation) on the matters in the form of normative (São Paulo, 1971a, 1971b).

THE CEE-SP AND THE PROCESSES OF EVALUATION AND REGULATION OF SÃO PAULO'S HEIS IN THE PERIOD 1997-2000

The processes of evaluation and regulation as components of the Higher Education System of the State of São Paulo (SESE) were analyzed based on the deliberations and regulations approved by the CEE/SP, more specifically by the Higher Education Chamber, in the period from 1997 to 2000.

Regarding the regulation process, it is worth mentioning that it is the CEE/SP's responsibility to authorize the operation and recognize state and municipal HEIs and their respective courses, among other attributions in Art. 2 of Law no. 10.403/1971.

In the 1990s - identified as the period of administrative neo-liberal reforms by several studies on evaluations and educational policies - there were several decisions and resolutions approved by the São Paulo State Education Council to establish authorization rules (Deliberação CEE n. 06/1999) for new undergraduate courses, including courses outside its headquarters or campuses. In general terms, this process of flexibilization of the authorization processes required the presentation of projects by the applicant's academic management, which contemplated the dimensions of infrastructure, and human and material resources, in addition to highlighting the social and educational importance of the course to be offered in another location. In addition, the processing of course authorization requests directed to the Chamber of Higher Education favored

the systematization of creating a State System of Evaluation Education in the SESE (São Paulo, 1999c).

In this sense, in 1999, the Chamber forwarded to CEE/SP the indication of creating the State System of Evaluation Teaching in the SESE. There was, among the counselors, the understanding that the HEIs, especially the universities, should be evaluated to assess their impact and social relevance and serve as an instrument to account for the investment received by society and the State. The argumentative construction that justified the evaluation process in higher education was based on Article 9, item VII, of the LDB of 1996. In this way, it was established as the competence of the CEE/SP the management of the accreditation processes, authorization, and recognition of State and municipal higher education institutions and courses, as well as the understanding that it would be necessary for the regulation, by the Council, of institutional evaluation processes, in the sense of attesting the quality of the education offered, as well as the accountability of the investment received to society by the HEIs.

From the Higher Education Chamber perspective, the institutional evaluation would enable diverse categories of higher education institutions to treat their academic and administrative specificities in a global and multidimensional way (teaching, research, extension, and management). Thus, the State System of Evaluation Education would comprise universities, university centers, integrated colleges, colleges, and higher education institutes, maintained by associations, autarchies, or foundations instituted by the state or municipal government. Through institutional evaluation, despite the adoption of the concepts “global” and “multidimensional” as aspects to be observed in the choice of evaluative criteria, only the general conditions of supply of undergraduate courses would be evaluated (São Paulo, 1999a; Garrossino, 2007).

In 2000, with the approval of deliberation CEE No. 04, it was established that the evaluation process would take place in three stages, whose results should be presented to the CEE/SP, namely: 1) institutional evaluation, with information from the institution; 2) on-site evaluation by experts, who must prepare a report resulting from the information and observations; and 3) conclusive opinion of the Reporting Counselor of the Higher Education Chamber.

As for the regulation processes, this period represented advances for the so-called Higher Education Institutes, whose authorization for full degree courses, even experimentally, could be requested by the CEE/SP, with the condition that they were linked to state or municipal public power instances, such as public universities and sponsoring entities (São Paulo, 2000).

Among the SESE HEI categories, the University Center would be the second with greater academic autonomy for course accreditation and re-accreditation, the first being the University. However, for accredited HEIs with recognized undergraduate courses to be able to become University Centers, there would be requirements to be met, and it is worth mentioning paragraphs IV and VI of art. 2nd of CEE Deliberation No. 08/1998, which stipulated the need to achieve a “C” concept in the National System of Course Evaluation for any course evaluated in the previous year as a condition for obtaining the request for accreditation marking the beginning of the incorporation of the results of the national evaluation by the São Paulo evaluation system, which later became a criterion in the accreditation processes of state universities (São Paulo, 1998; Brandalise et al., 2022).

ANALYSIS OF THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE EEC-SP PUBLISHED IN THE PERIOD FROM 2004 TO 2018

Next, the deliberations identified, selected, and analyzed in the investigative process are presented and categorized into three themes: regulation processes of São Paulo's HEIs, teacher education courses, and institutional self-assessment of the Institutions.

REGULATION PROCESSES OF SÃO PAULO'S HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Approved in the context of the publication of Law n.º 10.861/04, which established the SINAES, Deliberation n.º 48/05 gave us indications of continuity in the process of improvement of the state assessment system in articulation with the national assessment guidelines (São Paulo, 2005a). According to the document, the guidelines for the evaluation started to include two phases: institutional evaluation and evaluation of courses. The institutional evaluation, consisting of several stages, now requires the presentation of an institutional pedagogical project and the creation of an internal evaluation committee, in addition to establishing the stages and general guidelines. Although it does not present more details, the reading of Deliberation n.º 48/05 allowed us to infer that the Higher Education Chamber of the CEE/SP kept its autonomy to elaborate its criteria preserved, just like in other regulatory processes, especially Deliberation CEE No. 45/2004, in which the adoption of its system by the CEE/SP was recognized in the regulatory norms (São Paulo, 2004).

Because of the abundance of processes that dealt with the renewal of course recognition³, deliberation CEE n.º 54/2005 extended the validity of the recognition of courses whose renewal processes were in progress at the State Board of Education. The intention was not to cause damage to the graduates of the recognized Undergraduate Courses and the HEIs connected to the CEE/SP, especially regarding the process for registering diplomas (São Paulo, 2005b). In the same way, the CEE Deliberation No. 64/2007 (São Paulo, 2007a) extended the validity of the accreditation of the university centers, whose processes of re-accreditation were in progress at the State Board of Education, in such a way that those processes that were registered at the Board were extended, on an exceptional basis, until the procedures for the institutional evaluation required for such were concluded. Finally, the Deliberação CEE n.º 67/2007 (São Paulo, 2007b) extended the validity of the recognition of the Superior Normal Courses and Pedagogy to the new projects of Courses of Pedagogy/Degree Course adjusted to the National Curricular Directives and to the Deliberação CEE n.º 60/2006, due to the recent processes of implantation and recognition of the majority of the Normal Courses, that counted on the presence of specialists “in loco” involved in the analyses of the pedagogical projects, of the physical structures and the intellectual environment. Took all these actions to increase the number of courses recognized in the scope of the São Paulo state system, which, to a certain extent, demanded from CEE/SP a more significant investment in improving the evaluation procedures.

The Deliberação CEE n.º 147/2016 (São Paulo, 2016b) defined the specific processes for the authorization of specialization courses in scientific or technological research institutions, or even of a professionalizing nature, linked to the state system⁴.

The CEE deliberations described in this subsection demonstrate the investment of the São Paulo educational system in the standardization of the processes and procedures for evaluating and regulating HEIs in the last two decades. In the following subsection, we will present a synthesis of the deliberations, specifically on the higher education teacher education courses, aiming at discussing the performance of the CEE/SP in the face of the national guidelines and the autonomy of the state system.

³ The CEE Deliberations n.º 04/99 (São Paulo, 1999) and 04/2000 (São Paulo, 2000) evaluate non-university and university education institutions, respectively. The CEE Deliberations n.º 05/98, 08/98, and 12/98 deal with institutions' accreditation; finally, the CEE Deliberation n.º 07/2000 deals with the authorization, recognition, and renewal of recognition of undergraduate courses in HEIs under the jurisdiction of this Council.

⁴ CEE deliberations n.º 150/2016 (São Paulo, 2016c) and CEE n.º 164/2018 (São Paulo, 2018b) highlight the additions of devices to Deliberação CEE n.º 147, of 2016, already expressed in the document, which deals with the regulation, supervision, and evaluation of institutions and courses of higher education linked to the state system, but was revoked by Deliberação CEE n.º 171, of 2019.

FOCUS ON TEACHER EDUCATION COURSES

With the enactment of the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education (Law No. 9.394/1996), teacher training at a Higher level became a priority, “changing the status of the Medium Level Normal Course, the training instance for teachers of the initial series until then” (Oliveira & Abdian, 2014, p.532). From then on, many debates began to be held within the various movements of educators and national research associations to establish new curricular guidelines for higher education courses that would meet the new professional profile of generalist character. This movement, marked by intense debates, resulted in the promulgation of the National Curricular Guidelines expressed in the Resolution CNE/CP No. 01/06, whose orientations were accepted by the CEE/SP that, in the same year, approved the Deliberação CEE No. 60/2006 (São Paulo, 2006), in which new norms were established for the creation of graduate courses in Pedagogy/Degree Course, in terms of structure and workload.

The referred Deliberation understood that the form as the CEE/SP normalized the implantation of the Superior Institutes of Education (ISE) and the Institutions linked to it, should not suffer any alteration, fitting to the courses of Pedagogy, during a degree, to integrate to the existing ISE. However, it recognized that, given the content of the national directives, new normalization was necessary for consonance with the regional specificities.

In 2012, the CEE/SP approved the Deliberação CEE n° 111, establishing Complementary Curricular Guidelines for the Training of Teachers for Basic Education in Undergraduate Courses of Pedagogy⁵. The new state guidelines, applied to incoming classes as of the second semester of 2017, started to be used as a guiding document in the recognition processes of undergraduate courses throughout the state of São Paulo. These brief considerations were necessary because they demonstrate the effective exercise of autonomy in the scope of the CEE/SP in the definition of its norms focused on the evaluation and regulation of bachelor courses, taking into account the specificities and demands of the São Paulo education system. From then on, the norms expressed in the deliberations that regulate the processes of regulation, assessment, and supervision of São Paulo's HEIs, for purposes of requesting accreditation and recognition began to define as an essential criterion the adequacy of the undergraduate courses to the Deliberação CEE n° 111/2012.

SELF-EVALUATION OF THE IES

Deliberation No. 160/2018 (São Paulo, 2018a), which deals with the self-assessment process of Higher Education Institutions, defined the self-assessment process, its purpose, and the types of institutions contemplated by this deliberation.

According to Articles 2 and 3 of the deliberation, understood as a continuous and permanent process, self-assessment should encompass teaching, research, and extension, with the purpose of “monitoring, disciplining and guiding” the HEIs to ensure the quality of the “educational, scientific, cultural, and community actions,” as well as the conditions for offering their respective courses and the quality of administrative, financial, and human resources management (São Paulo, 2018a, p.1) (our translation).

It was established that the processes and procedures of self-assessment will be established itself, preserving institutional autonomy aiming to foster reflections that enable the identification of obstacles and indicate measures to overcome and improve academic activities by the institution.

⁵ The deliberations CEE n° 126/2014 (São Paulo, 2014), CEE n° 132/2015 (São Paulo, 2015), and CEE n° 154/2017 (São Paulo, 2017), sign changes and additions to the provisions in Deliberação CEE n° 111/2012, proposing mandatory curricular contents and requirements regarding the workload needed for teacher education courses, based on suggestions from public university teacher commissions. However, they maintain the general guidelines that guided the main proposals in Deliberação CEE n° 111/2012.

The highest collegiate body must carry out the approval of the evaluation project, and its execution, coordinated by the Permanent Evaluation Commission (CPA), must result in the elaboration of an Institutional self-assessment report, understood as “a fundamental requirement in the accreditation process of the proposing institution with the State Education Council” (São Paulo, 2018, p.2) (our translation).

Based on these considerations, in the next section, we will present and discuss the institutional self-assessment of a state university in São Paulo, aiming to understand the relationship between the norms established by CEE/SP and the dynamics of self-assessment at the local level.

SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESSES AT UNESP/SÃO JOSÉ DO RIO PRETO ARTICULATED TO THE STATE GUIDELINES OF THE CEE/SP

When dealing with the assessment and regulation processes present at the Unesp São José do Rio Preto/IBILCE campus, chosen as the field of study, we identified the existence of a computer system developed by the Database Group - GBD - the AvaliaIBILCE. This system was developed with the Permanent Teaching Commission (CPE) and the Academic Technical Section (STA) to analyze the undergraduate courses taught. According to information made available on the IBILCE⁶ website,

The system allows regularly enrolled students to evaluate their courses at the end of each semester. At the end of the evaluation period, course coordinators and professors of each subject have access to reports with the results of the evaluations. Such reports facilitate decision-making to improve the quality of education offered by IBILCE/UNESP (Ibilce, 2019, p.1) (our translation).

About Unesp's institutional evaluation, we found that it has been carried out with the support of an online platform, AVINST (Institutional Evaluation System), developed in partnership with the Special Evaluation Commission (CPA) and the Unesp Rectory. AVINST contains several questionnaires administrators can access, department heads, course coordinators, employees, undergraduate and graduate students, and former students, in addition to GRAL. In addition, the system has a report generation module that summarizes the questionnaire answers and serves as a basis for constructing the five-year reports.

Although AVINST is an essential instrument for generating data in the institutional assessment process, the five-year reports generated as a final product of the institutional assessment of Unesp bring together a set of data provided by various actors and collected by various assessment instruments. At different times, partial reports are made available, emphasizing the Capes reports, which evaluate graduate programs; the SINAES reports, which assess undergraduate courses; and the AVALIAExterna reports (online platform), which evaluate undergraduate courses with the support of external evaluators invited by local units. The reports also include data that can collect from the CNPq and FAPESP databases, among other databases of agencies that finance academic activities at the university under systems of agreements and partnerships.

According to the Deliberação do CEE n° 04/2000, should develop the process of institutional evaluation in the universe of the state system should be in three stages:

Art. 3 The evaluation process will be internal and developed in three stages:

- I - Up to one year from the effective date of this Deliberation, or the act of accreditation of a new institution, the General Planning of the internal evaluation work of the institution for a period of five years, with the respective schedule, shall be forwarded to the CEE;
- II - At the end of the third year, a report of the work already completed must be sent to the EEC;

⁶ Retrieved from <https://www.ibilce.unesp.br/#!/noticia/2423/avaliacao-de-disciplinas-do-ibilce-unesp/>

III - At the end of the fifth year, should submit a general implementation report with the respective conclusions (São Paulo, 2000, p.2) (our translation).

Also, according to the CEE Deliberation n° 04/2000, the assessment reports of the state universities must “be reviewed by a commission of five specialists, appointed by the Chamber of Higher Education and, subsequently, analyzed by it, through the opinion of the Reporting Councilor and by the Full Council, making the Institution aware of it” (São Paulo, 2000) (our translation).

As informed in the PDI/Unesp, the first cycle of the Institutional Evaluation of Unesp occurred from 2000 to 2004, the second between 2005 and 2009, the third from 2010 to 2014, and the fourth and last cycle from 2015 to 2019. The period meets the provisions of Article 5 of the Deliberation of the CEE n° 004/2000, which states that the internal assessment should be five-yearly, constituting a “fundamental requirement in the process of accreditation by the State Board of Education, as well as for recognition of the courses of the University and University Centers” (São Paulo, 2000) (our translation).

Also, according to the PDI, the third cycle aimed to understand the relations between the different evaluated dimensions in a way that the university was thought of as a whole and not from the dimensions or Dean's offices separately. Performed every five years, the evaluation will observe the evolution of Unesp and not the management defined in each mandate (Unesp, 2019).

From the evaluation of the five years 2010-2014, the actions of the IDP, approved in 2009, began to be taken as the main reference in institutional assessments, whose results support the reflection and definition of actions in addition to the review and preparation of the IDPs themselves and the Units Development Plans (PDUs). The evaluation programs for undergraduate and graduate courses are inserted among the various programs created to develop the actions proposed in the PDI/Unesp.

In 2018, Unesp approved a new system of Departmental Evaluation Planning in the implementation process. Approved by the Teaching, Research and Extension Council (CEPE), the Departmental Evaluation aims to involve faculty and researchers in the process of planning, self-evaluation, and evaluation of the activities promoted by the departments, providing the choice of priority variables for the conduct of the teaching, research, and extension work of the university that will base the Departmental Development Plans (PDDs) and offer new elements for the PDUs and the PDI. The evaluation centered on departments and not on individuals resulted from reflections made in the scope of the Forums of the Great Areas in collegiate bodies of Unesp and the CPA, which began to consider planning and evaluation as a systemic and continuous process. We infer that the data referring to the Departmental evaluation did not compose the 2019 report because it is recent and still in the implementation process.

The Institutional Evaluation Reports (2004-2009, 2010-2014, and 2015-2019) provided some clues on how the evaluation is organized and the main indicators considered in the process. A reading of the summaries shows that the institutional evaluation is aimed at evaluating the following dimensions: 1) undergraduate; 2) graduate; 3) research; 4) extension; and 5) management. The Institutional Assessment Report (2010-2014) reserved an item to reflect on the institutional trends, tensions, and challenges, and the Institutional Assessment Report (2004-2009) reserved a specific thing for the academic-administrative evaluation.

Recognized by Unesp as an element of self-management, institutional evaluation occurs through self-assessment, external evaluation, and evaluation of undergraduate and graduate courses. The various assessment instruments are created to favor the planning and self-evaluation of the units and their departments. The parameters and instruments approved by the Teaching, Research, and Extension Council (CEPE) and the University Council are referenced in the individual evaluation of professors and researchers. It is also worth mentioning that Unesp has created a

strategy to follow its graduates through the Alumni Portal, providing the evaluation of its courses and the insertion of former students in the labor market.

Thus, we will discuss below the dimensions and indicators of institutional assessment based on the institutional assessment reports analyzed.

UNDERGRADUATE EVALUATION

The evaluation of graduation is characterized, under the Sinaes, as one of the instruments that allow concepts to be assigned to the evaluated courses, such as the Enade Concept, Preliminary Course Concept (CPC), and General Index of Courses (IGC). The National Institute of Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira (Inep) is responsible for conducting the entire Sinaes evaluation process, including evaluating undergraduate courses in Brazil. In this process, the National Exam of Student Performance (Enade), applied to the final students of the evaluated courses of certain areas of knowledge, got protagonism. As highlighted by Dias Sobrinho (2008a, p.84) (our translation), “the idea of a system, a central principle of Sinaes, is gradually being lost, after its initial four years of difficult implementation, in favor of the protagonism now granted to a single instrument - the National Exam of Student Performance (Enade) [...]”.

Still, on the prominence that Enade received, Dias Sobrinho (2008b, p.821) (our translation) points out that the exam and the student “became the main sources of information for the formulation of quality indices”, considering control, hierarchization, comparison, and ranking as the main objectives. According to the author, this represents “a radical change in the evaluation paradigm: from the production of meanings and reflection on the values of knowledge and formation, to control, selection, classification in numerical scales” (Dias Sobrinho, 2008b, p.821) (our translation). The emphasis on the Enade imputes to students a large part of the responsibility for the quality of courses, considering that their performance in the test, as well as their opinion about the course plan and the infrastructure conditions, will be taken as main indicators of quality (Dias Sobrinho, 2008b).

In the case of Unesp evaluation, the Institutional Assessment Report (2010-2014) points out that the evaluation of undergraduate courses considers data related to the results obtained in evaluating student performance in ENADE, which is part of SINAES. However, because of the finding that ENADE data are relative, since there are records of students from some courses who attended the exam but did not answer the questions as a form of protest against the evaluation system, Unesp started to consider the data collected from the academic sections of the units and the data from the evaluation of external experts to the university who evaluate the course based on indicators related to the following dimensions: 1) Pedagogical project; 2) student body; 3) faculty body; 4) integration of the undergraduate course with graduate studies, research, and extension; 5) academic-administrative management; and 6) infrastructure evaluation.

As for the external evaluation, which is part of the institutional assessment process, it is noted that it is conducted through an online platform, the AVALIAExterna, a system developed by the CPA to bring together the assessments of all undergraduate courses at UNESP. The CPA and GRAL appoint the evaluators and enter into the system all the documents and information necessary for the evaluation to be carried out. Once the assessment process is completed, reports and opinions are generated that, together with data from the AVINST Platform (Institutional Assessment System) and other complementary data collected in different spaces, make up the final assessment report.

The data available in the quinquennial reports allowed us to identify the main items and indicators of the assessment of undergraduate courses of Unesp: 1) Students - indicating the number of graduates, enrolled, by units, profile (gender, color, place of residence, type of institution where they completed high school, education, attendance of pre-vestibular courses, access to

scholarships, family income, involvement in research and extension activities, completion of internships and exchanges and publications of academic papers); 2) Faculty - title, productivity and post-doctoral fellows, funded projects, extension projects and research orientations; 3) Courses - number of courses, number of candidates to the vestibular, demand and supply of vacancies, permanent and substitute teachers, student/course ratio and curriculum; 4) Infrastructure - classrooms, teaching and computer labs, libraries, university restaurants and student housing; 5) Graduation - policies of access and permanence and support programs for students in undergraduate courses; and 6) Evaluation - annual investments in policies and programs set forth in the IDP, and Monitoring of Graduates - Alumni Platform.

POST-GRADUATION EVALUATION AND INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

Since the mid-1990s, a period which saw, in Brazil, the consolidation of national evaluation systems in Basic and Higher Education, the post-graduation evaluation system has been undergoing successive reformulations coordinated by Capes through its Evaluation Board. Although it was established in the 1950s, the last three decades have been decisive in the expansion of the power of Capes in the field of evaluation due to the adoption of the evaluative model of managerial character, corresponding to the neoliberal perspective of public governance of the 1990s. Marked by the use of mechanisms for linking public education funding to performance rates referenced in universal indicators of quality formulated at the central level.

As discussed by Hostins (2006, p.144), in the case of Brazilian post-graduation, it was proposed to link resources to programs, to faculty and student productivity, and to the number of defended theses and dissertations, among other elements verified in the evaluation processes of Capes. In this context, the guiding documents of the post-graduation policies evidenced significant changes in the internal organization of the programs motivated by the evaluations, such as the reduction of the certification time, the redefinition of the courses offered, with greater emphasis on doctorate courses, the valorization of research linked to international projects, etc.

The changes were possible due to the effectiveness of strategies to raise the standard of performance of courses that “culminated in the adoption of standardized evaluation criteria to all areas, embodied in the evaluation system implemented from 1998” (Oliveira & Rothen, 2022, p.16) (our translation). Thus, Capes, in addition to representing the power of the State, acting based on decisions taken by dispersed members in a network of decentralized relations, having as its main function the construction of technical instruments of control that ensure “governmentality” (Foucault, 1979), consolidated itself as the main body for coordinating the processes and deliberation on the criteria for evaluation of programs, therefore, spaces of power and production of knowledge that guide institutional practices.

The reading of the Unesp reports evidenced that the requisites established by the National Post-Graduation Evaluation System were considered in the institutional assessment, expressing the strong relationship with the indicators based by Capes nationally and with the National Post-Graduation Plan. As a reflection of this movement, we identified the formulation of three specific graduate programs described in the Institutional Development Plan - a) graduate evaluation, b) excellence in graduate education, and c) insertion of the faculty in graduate studies. From a complete reading of the reports, we identified twenty-nine indicators distributed into six items: 1) students; 2) faculty; 3) courses; 4) infrastructure and investment; 5) assessment; 6) internationalization. Except for the indicator “follow-up of graduates” in the fifth item of the evaluation, the other indicators are quantitative, expressing the policy established in the national evaluation focused on developing standardized and classificatory instruments.

According to the Institutional Assessment Report (2010-2014), the analysis of the Research dimension was based on data collected through the AVINST Platform, the Unesp Statistical

Yearbook, with the information provided by the Deans of Research and Graduate Studies and obtained from the databases of funding agencies (Fapesp and CNPq) and international databases (Scimago and ISI Web of Knowledge). The use of digital platforms as a data collection instrument represents the rise of a new and sophisticated management model whose actions are controlled by centralized agencies that no longer exercise direct control over the subjects through inspection agents but indirect control performed by technologies installed in digital platforms accessed and filled out by the very subjects that work in the evaluated institutions. Generates quantifiable data that make it possible to assess the average institutional performance based on common external criteria and to classify the institutions in quality rankings.

We observed that the analysis of the indicators in the reports was based on the research programs defined in the IDP. Among them, the following stand out Program Incentive and Consolidation of Research, Support for Research Infrastructure, Internationalization of Unesp, and Support for the consolidation of Complementary Units and Animal Facilities. The Institutional Evaluation of Research was based on more than thirty indicators distributed into six items: 1) investments and infrastructure; 2) students; 3) professors; 4) production; 5) impact of intellectual production; 6) research projects. In addition, the arrangement of the data presented reveals that both the evaluation of graduate studies and the evaluation of research activities at the investigated state university incorporated the national policy guidelines, demonstrating the inductive character of the national evaluation systems established under the logic of the New Public Management.

INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION OF THE EXTENSION

The institutional evaluation of the extension is inserted in Article 3 of the law that created the SINAES, Law nº 10.861/2004, whose article foresees ten institutional dimensions that should be contemplated in the evaluation of the HEIs. Subsection II of the referred article highlights the “II - the policy for teaching, research, graduate studies, extension and the respective forms of operationalization, including the procedures for stimulating academic production, research scholarships, monitoring and other modalities” (Brazil, 2004). With the MEC Ordinance No. 92/2014, the dimensions are reorganized into five axes (1. Planning and Institutional Assessment, 2. Institutional Development, 3. Academic Policies, 4. Management Policies, and 5. Infrastructure), and the extension is inserted into the second dimension when it seeks the “coherence between the IDP and the extension practices”, and in the third dimension, in the indicator “Institutional policies and academic-administrative actions for the extension” (Brazil, 2014) (our translation).

At Unesp/São José do Rio Preto, the evaluation of University Extension from the 2010-2014 evaluation cycle started using the National University Extension Policy (PNEU) as a parameter. The report highlights that, as of 2013, changes, extinctions, and registered the creation of activities in an attempt to redefine the extension and align it with the PNEU, as established in the General Regulations of University Extension at Unesp, approved in 2012 in Unesp Resolution nº 11/2012.

The Pro-Rector of Extension (PROEx) - the academic body responsible for extension - as a member of the National Forum of Pro-Rectors of Extension, articulated itself to this perspective to overcome the extensionist function as a provider of services to the community and the promotion within the institution of projects, programs and extension activities that meet the challenges of Brazilian society today (Unesp, 2014, p.63) (our translation).

Given the changes in perspectives on university extension expressed in the national extension policy, the evaluation aimed to analyze to what extent these changes were appropriated by the Pro-Rector of Extension (PROEx) and how extension activities began to articulate more directly with the other activities developed in the context of teaching and research in undergraduate and graduate courses. The evaluation of extension also considered PROEx's investments in

extension programs foreseen in the PDI: Institutional Enhancement of Extension Activities; Implementation of Extension Activities; Social Courses Program; and Dissemination of Historical and Cultural Heritage. It also highlighted the investment in activities that were already being developed at Unesp, such as the activities of the *Cursinhos Pré-vestibulares* (Pre-College Courses), the social projects of the Open University for the Third Age (Unati), the Youth and Adult Education Program (Peja), the Unesp Black Center for Research and Extension (Nupe), among others (Unesp, 2014, p.64).

Following the same trend as the previous dimensions - undergraduate, graduate, and research - the extension dimension reduced investments from 25.3 million reais (2010-2014) to 21.5 million reais (2015-2019). The evaluation group highlighted the difficulty in diagnosing extension activities since Unesp has no updated database that contemplates these activities. Given this challenge, the source used was AVINST, a platform that gathers data fed by the Academic Technical Directorates of the units, with an average collaboration rate of 80%.

In the 2014-2019 report, there was the addition of an item in the report focused on the registration and analysis of cultural actions and programs aimed at institutionalizing Culture at the University. Actions developed for institutionalizing Culture at the University were presented for implementing the Cultural Policy of Unesp in the units. The essential items and indicators prioritized for the evaluation of extension activities are 1) Investments and Infrastructure - its resources, equipment, scholarships, permanence policy, and cultural actions; 2) Faculty members - application of the Minimum Criteria of Faculty Performance, which place extension activities in a level of relevance, percentage of faculty involved in extension activities and types of extension activities that faculty members participate in; 3) Students - a percentage of undergraduate students involved in extension activities, types of extension activities in which students participate, and percentage of students approved in university entrance examinations who participated in the pre-vestibular course; and 4) Projects and Extension Programs - integration between extension, undergraduate teaching and research, social and educational relevance, technological relevance, exchange, university/society, types of activities carried out, among other indicators.

MANAGEMENT

For institutional managers, the results of institutional assessment processes are sources of indicators that improve institutional quality. Bernardes and Rothen (2015) point out that they demand, in a certain way, many internal actions by managers and the academic community, which can be challenging. However, it is unquestionable that the results favor institutional decision-making, given the relevance of the information produced from a broad participation process of the entire academic community.

Therefore, when analyzing Article 2 of the CEE Deliberation n° 160/2018, we also verified the importance of the processes of institutional evaluation and regulation as sources of indicators and started to wonder about the possible unfolding of these processes on the actions of managers, aiming at the development and institutional maintenance for educational quality. Finally, considering the limits of a documental study in institutional analysis, we restrict this section to a reflective analysis of the characteristics and conceptions of management present in institutional evaluation.

Taking as an assumption the link between assessment, regulation, and institutional management, when analyzing the data from Unesp, we found in the documents the adoption of a managerial perspective regarding the strong investment in the execution of the goals of the programs defined in the Institutional Development Plan (PDI), by the Dean of Administration (PRAd), currently called Dean of Strategic Planning and Management (PROPEG).

The sources used to obtain the necessary data to evaluate this dimension were collected in PROPEG's databases, the Unesp Statistical Yearbooks, the Unesp payroll Systems, the bases of the Unesp Information Technology Coordination (CTINF), the Unesp Patrimony Systems, and the Unesp Student Permanence Coordination and Vice-Rector's Office.

As for the data concerning the indicators that assess the quality of human, teaching, and infrastructure resources, they are presented quantitatively, without qualitative analysis of the institutional reality, based on the objectives of the IDP. In this sense, the managerial character of the evaluative process, embodied in reports prioritizing quantitative data over qualitative analyses, as Bernardes and Rothen (2015) point out, indicates the dispute between the functions of regulation and emancipation in the processes of institutional assessment within the HEIs. In our view, this dispute intensifies while the interpretation of quantitative data can both encourage the adoption of punitive and rewarding practices by managers since numerical data can lead to the accountability of the results in specific sectors and encourage collective reflection processes that lead to a broader understanding of the originating elements of these same data.

Dias Sobrinho (2004) points out that there are two paradigms present in higher education: market logic and the public good. There are HEIs that experience, in their management practices, this dilemma, and this may bring losses but also benefits for institutional management, whose challenge, during the revision of the constitutive elements of the regulation processes, in our view, is to find the balance between the actions resulting from the analysis of quantitative data, usually supported by more objective and concrete instruments, and the actions resulting from the reflective processes enhanced by qualitative studies that move in the direction of proposing more subjective and formative goals. Thus, regulatory processes, in the logic of the public good, should prioritize the participation of the academic community democratically and creatively.

Another fact that draws attention is the significant change in the evaluation format in the three evaluation cycles. We observe that the reports in the first two cycles (2005-2014) express the valorization of data collected from the academic community, which evaluated the different levels of satisfaction, and data that evaluated the improvement of the quality of service about the demands (vacancies, number of teachers, new courses, infrastructure, etc.). In the last cycle (2015-2019), the management dimension focused strictly on the budget analysis, especially the executed budgets, reflecting the solid tendency for the prevalence of market logic in public management.

By analyzing the institutional self-assessment reports of Unesp, we conclude that the indicators and criteria used in the evaluation of institutional management in recent years reflect the intense conceptual dispute between two different management paradigms that, borrowing the terminology coined by Dias Sobrinho (2002) when reflecting on higher education, we can call market management and management as a public good. The challenge, however, is to understand the real impact that both paradigms may have on institutional management and the possibilities of reviewing and improving the ongoing evaluation processes.

CONCLUSION

Despite being confirmed as a centralized process coordinated by the Rectorate of Unesp, we conclude that the institutional assessment at Unesp/IBILCE reflects the preservation of the autonomy of the São Paulo state HEIs in the development of internal assessment processes at the local level.

The analyzed HEI has instituted self-assessment processes continuously and permanently linked to the different sectors that constitute it. The reports indicate that self-assessment is a dynamic process, and the incorporation of the guidelines established by the State Council is limited to the fulfillment of general guidelines established by the national (SINAES) and state systems, reserving itself the task of elaborating the self-assessment according to the goals and projects

present in the Institutional Development Plan (PDI) to the institution. However, this finding does not disregard the strong influence of the Brazilian higher education assessment policies, especially in defining quality indicators of the assessed items and questions.

The instruments used in self-assessment, described in the Unesp Institutional Self-assessment Reports, reveal a strong investment in structuring a sophisticated information collection system, such as the AVINST Platform, which subsidizes the work of the CPA.

Authors' Contributions: Oliveira, M. E. N.: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article, critical review of important intellectual content; Borges, R. M.: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article, critical review of important intellectual content; Bernardes, J. S.: conception and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article, critical review of important intellectual content. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Ethics Approval: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

REFERENCES

Bardin, L. (1995). *Análise de conteúdo*. São Paulo: Edições 70.

Bernardes, J. dos S., & Rothen, J. C. (2015). Comissão Própria de Avaliação: dois lados de uma mesma moeda. *Estudos em Avaliação Educacional*, 26(62), 420-446.

Brasil. (2004). 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: Congresso Nacional. Recuperado de https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2004-2006/2004/lei/110.861.htm

Brasil. (2014). Portaria MEC nº 92, de 31 de janeiro de 2014. Aprova, em extrato, os indicadores do Instrumento de Avaliação Institucional Externa para os atos de credenciamento, recredenciamento e transformação de organização acadêmica, modalidade presencial, do Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior - SINAES. Brasília: MEC. Recuperado de https://www.semesp.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/porINEP_n92_31_01.pdf

Brandalise, M. T., Borges, R. M., Oliveira, M. E. N. O. N., & Silva, N. F. (2022). Políticas de Avaliação e Regulação da Educação Superior para as IES estaduais: interfaces entre os Conselhos Estaduais de Educação e o SINAES. *Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação*, 38(00), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.21573/vol38n002022.122763>

Dias Sobrinho, J. (2004). Avaliação ética e política em função da educação como direito público ou como mercadoria? *Educação & Sociedade*, 25(88), 703-725.

Dias Sobrinho, J. (2008a). Avaliação da educação superior: avanços e riscos. *EccoS – Revista Científica*, 10, 67-93.

Dias Sobrinho, J. (2008b). Qualidade, Avaliação: do Sinaes aos índices. *Avaliação*, 13(3), 817-825.

Chizzotti, A. (2006). *Pesquisa em ciências humanas e sociais*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.

Foucault, M. A. (1979). *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.

Garrossino, S. R. B. (2007). A contribuição de Dermeval Saviani no Conselho Estadual de Educação de São Paulo (1984-1987) (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual Paulista, Marília, SP, Brasil.

Hostins, R. C. L. (2006). Os Planos Nacionais de Pós-graduação (PNPG) e suas repercussões na Pós-graduação brasileira. *Perspectiva*, 24(1), 133-160.

Ibilce. Instituto de Biociências, Letras e ciências Exatas. (2019). AVALIAIBILCE, Sistema de avaliação de disciplinas. Recuperado de <https://www.ibilce.unesp.br/#!/noticia/2423/avaliacao-de-disciplinas-do-ibilce-unesp/>

Lüdke, M., & André, M. (1986). Pesquisa em educação: abordagens qualitativas. São Paulo: EPU.

Oliveira, M. E. N., & Abdian, G. Z. (2014) Formação de professores: as diretrizes nacionais e o poder local. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, 14(42), 527–548. <https://doi.org/10.7213/dialogo.educ.14.042.AO01>

Oliveira, M. E. N., & Rothen, J. C. (2022). A Política de Avaliação da Pós-Graduação no Brasil: um estudo documental (1998-2018) a partir da área da Educação. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 29(2), 1-15.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1971a). Lei nº. 10.403, de 06 de julho de 1971. Reorganiza o Conselho Estadual de Educação. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1971b). Decreto nº. 52.811, de 6 de outubro de 1971. Aprova o Regimento do Conselho Estadual de Educação. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. Decreto nº 9.887, de 14 de junho de 1977. (1977). Organiza as unidades de apoio técnico e administrativo do Conselho Estadual de Educação, define às competências das autoridades desse Órgão e dá providências correlatas. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1998). Deliberação CEE nº. 08/1998. Dispõe sobre o credenciamento e reconhecimento de centros universitários para o Sistema de Ensino do Estado de São Paulo. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1999a). Deliberação CEE nº. 04/2000. Dispõe sobre o processo de avaliação das Instituições de Educação Superior do Sistema Estadual de Ensino. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1999b). Deliberação CEE nº. 06/1999. Fixa normas para autorização e instalação de classes descentralizadas no sistema de ensino do Estado de São Paulo. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (1999c). Deliberação CEE nº. 08/1999. Dispõe sobre a autorização para funcionamento de cursos regulares fora da sede de universidades. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2000). Deliberação nº 04/2000. Dispõe sobre o processo de avaliação de Universidade e de Centro Universitário do Sistema Estadual de Ensino. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2004). Deliberação nº 45. Altera prazos previstos para o credenciamento e renovação de credenciamento das Instituições, reconhecimento e renovação de reconhecimento de Cursos. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2005a). Deliberação nº 48. Dispõe sobre o processo de avaliação das faculdades, faculdades integradas e institutos superiores de educação do sistema estadual de ensino. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2005b). Deliberação nº 54. Prorroga a validade do reconhecimento dos Cursos cujos processos de renovação se encontrem tramitando no Conselho Estadual de Educação. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2006). Deliberação nº 60. Estabelece normas para a criação de cursos de graduação em Pedagogia, licenciatura, bem como normatiza a adequação dos Cursos Normais Superiores e de Pedagogia existentes, às novas Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais expressas na Resolução CNE/CP nº 1/06. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2007a). Deliberação nº 64. Prorroga a validade do credenciamento dos centros universitários, cujos processos de reconhecimento se encontrem tramitando no Conselho Estadual de Educação. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2007b). Deliberação nº 67. Estende a validade do reconhecimento dos Cursos Normais Superiores e de Pedagogia aos novos projetos de Cursos de Pedagogia, Licenciatura, adequados às Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais e à Deliberação CEE nº 60/2006. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2008). Deliberação nº 75. Dispõe sobre pedidos de credenciamento, reconhecimento, autorização, reconhecimento renovação do reconhecimento de cursos de graduação de Instituições de Ensino Superior. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2014). Deliberação nº 126. Altera dispositivos da Deliberação 111/2012. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2015). Deliberação nº 132. Acresce dispositivo na Deliberação CEE nº 111/2012. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2016a). Deliberação nº 145. Fixa normas para a admissão de docentes para o exercício da docência em cursos de estabelecimentos de ensino superior, vinculados ao sistema estadual de ensino de São Paulo, e os percentuais de docentes para os processos de credenciamento, recredenciamento, autorização de funcionamento, reconhecimento e renovação de reconhecimento. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2016b). Deliberação nº 147. Dispõe sobre o credenciamento de escolas de governo, instituições de pesquisa científica ou tecnológica, ou de natureza profissional no Sistema de Ensino do Estado de São Paulo, bem como, sobre a aprovação e validade de cursos de especialização por elas oferecidos. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2016c). Deliberação nº 150. Acresce dispositivo na Deliberação CEE Nº 142/2016. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2017). Deliberação nº 154. Dispõe sobre alteração da Deliberação CEE nº 111/2012. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2018a). Deliberação nº 160. Dispõe sobre o processo de autoavaliação de Instituições de Ensino Superior vinculadas ao Sistema Estadual de Ensino de São Paulo. São Paulo.

São Paulo. Conselho Estadual de Educação. (2018b). Deliberação nº 164. Acrescenta dispositivos na Deliberação CEE 142/2016. São Paulo.

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (1999). Resolução Unesp nº 84, de 04 de novembro de 1999. Estabelece diretrizes para a atuação da Comissão Permanente de Avaliação (CPA). São Paulo.

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (2009). Plano de Desenvolvimento Institucional 2009. São Paulo: Unesp.

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (2014). Relatório de Avaliação Institucional (2010-2014). São Paulo: Unesp.

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (2016). Plano de Desenvolvimento Institucional 2016. São Paulo: Unesp.

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (2019). Plano de Desenvolvimento Institucional (2019-2028). São Paulo: Unesp. Recuperado de <https://www2.unesp.br/portal#!pdi/documentos/documentos/>

Unesp. Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho. (2021). Relatório de Avaliação Institucional (2015-2019). São Paulo: Unesp.

Received: 13 November 2022 | **Accepted:** 9 February 2023 | **Published:** 4 April 2023



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.