Article

Revista Internacional de Educação Superior
International Journal of Higher Education

Public evaluation policies in higher education: recontextualization and challenges of the practice at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

Marcia Giraldez Evald[1] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3988-3915
Gustavo de Oliveira Figueiredo[2] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2724-8826

ABSTRACT

Introduction/Objective: This article discusses the results of a research at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) that had as main goals to analyze the public policies discourse about evaluation on higher education in Brazil and to understand how they are recontextualized in the institutional practice. **Methodology**: Based on the historic-dialectical approach was analyzed how neoliberal reforms shapes the formulation and development of such evaluation in the practices from public universities. responsible for the institutional evaluation at the university, especially in the Center for Health Sciences, including interviews with the directors of the Medicine, Dentistry, Nutrition and Nursing Faculties. **Results**: The data was processed based on content analysis and the results were organized into five dimensions: 1. Relationships between neoliberalism, globalization and higher education; 2. University reforms and educational policies in Brazil; 3. The diversity of multiple approaches in evaluation; 4. The National Assessment System on Higher Education; 5. Challenges for assessment practices at UFRJ. The tension between the discourse of participatory evaluation and the hierarchical reality of evaluation practices as devices for implementing regulation, control and performance technologies became evident. **Conclusion**: Although the importance of the work carried out by the university is undeniable that the evaluation practices are not very participatory and are not related to a process of institutional learning and development.

KEYWORDS

Educational policies. Higher education. Assessment. Public University. Public policies

Corresponding to Author

[1] Marcia Giraldez Evald
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E-mail: mgiral@gmail.com
CV Lattes
http://lattes.cnpq.br/5966467258965727

[2] Gustavo de Oliveira Figueiredo
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil E-mail:
gfigueiredo.ufrj@gmail.com
CV Lattes
http://lattes.cnpq.br/2774615732286626

Submmited: 10 Oct. 2020
Accepted: 12 May 2021
Published: 30 Sep. 2022

doi 10.20396/riesup.v10i00.8661573
e-location: e024005

ISSN 2446-9424

Checagem Antiplagiarismo
turnitin

Distribuído sobre

CC BY

Políticas públicas de avaliação na educação superior: recontextualização e desafios da prática na Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

RESUMO

Introdução/Objetivo: O artigo discute resultados de uma pesquisa na Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) que teve como objetivos analisar o discurso das políticas públicas de avaliação para o ensino superior no Brasil e compreender como elas são recontextualizadas na prática da instituição. **Metodologia**: Fundamentado na abordagem histórico-dialética analisou como as reformas neoliberais têm interferido na formulação e desenvolvimento das práticas de avaliação na universidade pública. Os conceitos de Stephen Ball sobre recontextualização e ciclo de políticas nos auxiliaram na compreensão do hiato entre o texto da política e sua realidade na prática. Foram realizadas entrevistas semiestruturadas com setores e instâncias estratégicas responsáveis pela avaliação na universidade, com ênfase no Centro de Ciências da Saúde, incluindo diretores dos cursos de Medicina, Odontologia, Nutrição e Enfermagem. **Resultados**: Os dados foram

interpretados com apoio da técnica de análise de conteúdo e os resultados agrupados em cinco dimensões de análise: 1. Relações entre neoliberalismo, globalização e educação superior; 2. Reformas universitárias e políticas educacionais no Brasil; 3. A diversidade das múltiplas abordagens teóricas sobre avaliação; 4. O Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior; 5. Desafios na prática de avaliação na UFRJ. Ficou evidente a tensão entre o discurso da avaliação participativa e a realidade hierarquizada das práticas de avaliação como dispositivos para implementar tecnologias de regulação, controle e desempenho. Conclusão: Embora seja inegável a importância do trabalho que é desenvolvido pela universidade, as práticas de avaliação são pouco participativas e não estão relacionadas a um processo de aprendizado e desenvolvimento institucional.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE
Políticas educacionais. Educação superior. Avaliação. Universidade pública. Políticas públicas.

Políticas públicas de evaluación en la educación superior: Recontextualizacióny desafíos en la práctica de Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro

RESUMEN
Introdución/Objectivo: El artículo discute los resultados de una investigación en la Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro (UFRJ) que tuvo como objetivo analizar el discurso de las políticas públicas de evaluación de la educación superior en Brasil y comprender cómo ellas se recontextualizan en la práctica institucional. **Metodología**: Con base en el enfoque histórico-dialéctico, se analizó cómo las reformas neoliberales han interferido en la formulación y desarrollo de prácticas de evaluación. Los conceptos de recontextualización y ciclo de políticas de Stephen Ball nos ayudaron a comprender la brecha entre el texto de la política y su realidad en la práctica. Se realizaron entrevistas semiestructuradas con sectores estratégicos responsables por la evaluación en la universidad, incluidos los directores de las carreras de Medicina, Odontología, Nutrición y Enfermería. **Resultados**: Los datos fueron interpretados con la técnica de análisis de contenido y los resultados fueron agrupados en cinco dimensiones: 1. Relaciones entre neoliberalismo, globalización y educación superior; 2. Reformas universitarias y políticas educativas en Brasil; 3. La diversidad de múltiples enfoques teóricos de la evaluación; 4. El Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Educación Superior; 5. Desafíos en la práctica de la evaluación en UFRJ. Se hizo evidente la tensión entre el discurso de evaluación participativa y la realidad jerárquica de las prácticas de evaluación como dispositivos para implementar tecnologías de regulación, control y desempeño. **Conclusión**: Si bien es innegable la importancia del trabajo que realiza la universidad, las prácticas de evaluación son poco participativas y no se relacionan con un proceso de aprendizaje y desarrollo institucional.

PALABRAS CLAVE
Políticas educativas. Educación universitaria. Evaluación. Universidad pública. Políticas públicas.

CRediT

- **Recognitions**: Not applicable.
- **Financing**: Not applicable.
- **Conflicts of interest**: The authors certify that they have no commercial or associational interest that represents a conflict of interest with respect to the manuscript.
- **Ethical approval**: Not applicable.
- **Availability of data and material**: Not applicable .
- **Author´s contribuitions**: Conceptualization, Curation, Formal analysis, Acquisition of funding, Research, Methodology, Project management, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft; Writing - revision and editing: Giraldez, M. E.; Figueiredo, G. O.

Section Editor: Andréia Aparecida Simão

1 Introduction

At the beginning of the 21st century, we are experiencing a time of great transformations in the world scenario in relation to science and technology. These changes are causing contemporary societies to go through major challenges, which require new models of education and curricula capable of training professionals who can act in the face of complex facts, growing competition, uncertainty about the future and the accelerated speed of change in a context of neoliberal hegemony (GESSER; RANGHETTI, 2011).

In recent decades, there has been an international movement that has driven a series of educational reforms that resulted in modifications in education policies and in greater regulation of education through vertical and centralized models of evaluation, given the considerable increase in higher education courses, to meet the need for labor. Brazil has also been debating and promoting these changes both in the field of public policies and in the evaluation practices of the education sector. Since the nineties, as a result of the approval of the Law of Directives and Bases of Education (BRASIL, 1996) and, more recently, with the implementation of the National System of Evaluation of Higher Education - SINAES (BRASIL, 2004), several evaluation policies have been developed for the regulation of education, which, from its origin, has as its central objective to evaluate and seek the quality of education.

This research aimed to analyze the discourse in the text of the Public Policies of Evaluation for Higher Education in Brazil, focusing on the SINAES, and identify how its recontextualization occurs in the practices of evaluation of undergraduate courses at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). The discourse of the policies is based on the justification of the need for evaluation to improve the quality of education, in practice important questions arise: How are these policies recontextualized and developed in practice? The National System for Educational Evaluation contributes to the improvement of the quality of higher education in the country or is it just an element of the managerialist neoliberal approach of institutional regulation?

Facing the reality of Higher Education Institutions in the country, it is observed that the dialogue between theory and practice is still very distant. This occurs not only because of ignorance of the laws that guide the evaluation policies, but also because, most of the time, the Institutions perform the evaluation actions in a bureaucratic way, almost always aiming to meet vertically imposed demands, without the evaluation procedures, the 3 indicators (evaluation of institutions, courses and student performance) and the results being shared with the actors who are part of the educational process.

To better understand this scenario, we bring the concepts of performativity and recontextualization (Ball, 2005) that can be used when discussing the issue of production and performance. While some groups will interpret an imposition as natural and, therefore, will seek to achieve the goals set by it; others, however, will resist the demand. Each group acts

from its understandings, from which it is diffused that the performances of individual subjects or organizations serve as parameters of productivity, of result, or even serve as demonstrations of "quality", "moments" for promotion or inspection. Performativity is a technology, a culture, and a method of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons, and demonstrations as means of control, attrition, and change. (BALL, 2005, p. 543).

Performativity seeks in performance, whether individual or institutional, the basis for productivity, to make up the data for instituted demands. It often is beneficial when, in fact, it is a bureaucratic measure that creates data used to punish, rank, or regulate educational activity. The word "quality" is often seen in this context, in which one seeks to evaluate the characteristics of a particular course or activity to then rank them. Thus, it can be said that performativity plays a crucial role in contemporary educational policies. It contributes to integrate and resize activities, processes, and results. It facilitates the monitoring of the State and enables its intrusion in cultures, practices and subjectivities of educational institutions and their professionals (MOREIRA, 2009, p. 33).

It is also important to bring the concept of regulation, in the text of Trevisan and Sarturi (2016), is seen as one of the functions related to external evaluation, which, by measuring results, acts as a mechanism for ranking institutions, serving a logic of neoliberal state. Evaluation has been used for different purposes and with different consequences, such as control by the State - by applying large-scale exams -, promotion of rankings, and competition between public schools or between public and private schools. This establishes a control that satisfies a bureaucratic logic that is articulated as one of the mechanisms of the educational market.

In the field of higher education, Real (2009) writes that academic studies developed on this theme have criticized the national policy of higher education, especially the one that induces the evaluation process. These studies evidenced the constitution of an evaluating State in the Brazilian context that, from the adoption of a "competitive ethos", classified the institutions through the evaluation of the student's performance, generating competition, while it intended to induce the improvement in the quality of education. These studies, by processing the criticism and revealing the logic implicit in the evaluation system adopted, sought to contribute to the educational policy, pointing out its vices and a questionable quality generated by the policy adopted in the face of the values announced as constituents of the Brazilian Federative Republic (REAL, 2009, p. 575).

Against this logic, we seek to understand the evaluation processes from a participatory perspective (Saul, 1985), as a process in which subjects reshape the action of evaluation. We seek to problematize the regulatory view of evaluation in order to think about possibilities of assuming a more procedural, formative, and participatory view. We believe that, beyond control, surveillance and punishment mechanisms, evaluation can work to (re)organize practices, (re)articulate interpersonal relationships, (re)mediate power disputes, and (re)assert the importance of everyone feeling part of the process.

This article analyzes public evaluation policies for higher education in Brazil and discusses how they are recontextualized in the institutional practice of UFRJ in order to identify and describe the tensions and conflicts that permeate the issue in this institution and confront them with the material found in the literature review on the subject. In addition to interviews with directors of four UFRJ units that offer undergraduate courses, and interviews with members of two UFRJ sectors that have evaluation as their object of work, namely: the Center for Institutional Research (NPI) and the Special Evaluation Commission (CPA).

2 Contextualization of the study - Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

The challenges in the field of evaluation cannot be understood without analyzing the tension between the world and national scenarios, currently marked by globalization and by a set of neoliberal reforms, which impact the field of educational policies. With this, we see an increasingly competitive and individualistic educational scenario, and evaluation serves not only as a diagnostic method for improving the quality of education, but at the same time, as a mechanism for regulating educational institutions. It is in this dialectical dispute that numerous conflicts arise.

When we decided to talk about the evaluation of undergraduate courses, we observed the need to verify how this subject is dealt with internally at UFRJ. Thus, we sought information in the sectors of the university that deal with issues related to institutional assessment and verified that it has an assessment center, called the Center for Institutional Research, which organizes the necessary information for the evaluation related to ENADE, and for the accreditation and reaccreditation of undergraduate courses. Besides this, each center of the university also has its own Evaluation Committee, responsible for answering to the National Institute for Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira - INEP/MEC for UFRJ's institutional evaluation and for the performance of the institution on the National Student Performance Exam - ENADE.

The Federal University of Rio de Janeiro is a legal entity of public law, structured as an autarchy of special nature, with didactic, scientific, administrative, disciplinary, and financial management autonomy, with the mission of "providing the Brazilian society with the means to produce, master, expand, cultivate, apply, and disseminate the universal heritage of human knowledge, enabling all its members to act as a transforming force" (UFRJ, 2019, p. 19). Understanding how evaluation happens at the University is, therefore, a relevant point in the social-political context in which we live, because, from it, it is possible to have data that allow a more directed and organized action by education professionals.

Evaluation in higher education involves the subjects' work process and, therefore, reveals power relations, being, therefore, a delicate issue that crosses interests, worldviews, and individual experiences. Although it is a relevant theme in education, it is also, many times, a source of fear. One of the possible difficulties present in the process is based on the individual's fear of being judged and bought off when undressing from prejudices to make a

self-evaluation and check the quality with which a job is done. In the case of teachers and students, evaluation is directly associated with personal performance, and the result of the process tends to ignore the historical, social, cultural, political and economic contexts in which the institution and the subjects are inserted.

The subjects involved can experience this in two ways: either they accommodate and reproduce it, although they also repudiate it, or they resist these imposed models, just not applying them or reinventing themselves and building their own model, We find this thought in Boaventura Souza Santos (2011), when he brings in his work the issue of neoliberalism in the university with its consequences, as well as in Ball (2001) with the concept of performativity and the concept of recontextualization, where he mentioned how laws are put into practice.

It is important to mention the political and legal aspects of the process, since we are dealing with evaluation policies governed by legal instruments, which hold institutions and subjects responsible for the results obtained. Evaluation is based on norms, which must be applied, and which generate consequences. Since no social practice can be considered impartial, we cannot claim that evaluation policies are free from the influence of groups with different interests; ,political subjects are frequently recontextualizing and reinterpreting the legal texts of the policy put into practice.

We start from the hypothesis that there are no gaps between the text of public policies and the concrete practices of institutions, but rather a process of recontextualization of these policies due to the multiple interests in dispute in this field. Knowing the practices developed at this University and the perception of the subjects about them will allow our approach on the theme to have a critical perspective on the way neoliberal reforms find resistance in public spaces. Perhaps, what is often seen, at first, as ill will and disorganization, may be a way of opposing evaluation when it is treated only as a mechanism for regulation and performance control. Since no social practice can be considered impartial, we cannot claim that evaluation policies are free from the influence of groups with different interests, after all, political subjects are frequently recontextualizing and reinterpreting the legal texts of the policy put into practice, thus, it is important to bring Ball's (2001) thought about policy cycle and recontextualization to support our study. That is also why it is important to bring into our study Dalila Oliveira (2005) who shows us in her work how evaluation has become an instrument of regulation, seeking classification, comparison, and competition.

3 Neoliberalism, globalization, and public evaluation policies in education

We seek to make an analysis of the educational context, focusing, especially, on the university environment, from concepts of neoliberalism and globalization. As a theoretical basis, we rely on the ideas of Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2011), Stephen Ball (2001, 2011), Dalila Oliveira (2005), Ana Maria Saul (1985), Dias Sobrinho (2008).

Mainly Sousa-Santos (2011) and Ball (2001) show us how neoliberalism and globalization, contexts that are based on the market and overproduction, are present in our daily lives and impose what should or should not be done for the sake of profit and productivity. The interest of these policies is not only economic, political, and social, but there is also the intention to defend a globalized and uniform education. Thus, one can see the focus on the union of countries, aiming at a better educational integration and the construction of a model to be followed. The authors also highlight other consequences of these models, such as the exploitation of the working class and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a small portion of society, whose main objective is to regulate individuals, and not give conditions to reflect on the process and how to incorporate the results in institutional practice, this system of oppression is no different from that experienced by most of the population (Sousa-Santos, 2011; Ball, 2001).

From this perspective, Sousa-Santos (2011) addresses the concept of "commodification of the University," which was present until the mid-1990s, with the expansion and consolidation of the national university market. From this emerges the transnational market of higher education, which, in the late 1990s, joins the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, seeking global solutions for education as well. For this author, from the 1980s on, the neoliberal model brings with it the loss of priorities such as education, health, and social security, and the devaluation of public goods, with the intent to privatize, including universities. According to the author, the university cannot be seen as a sector of the economy that provides educational services, nor can it have an industrial bias. Although much is studied and talked about the university, there is no considerable number of research on institutional self-evaluation. (SOUSA-SANTOS, 2011).

On the other hand, we cannot accept the imposition of a model just because it worked somewhere else. It is important to understand the reasons for its success but applying it without first checking the context goes against our goal for education, since it is not organized from practices applied in masse. It is in this sense that Ball (2001, p. 102) argues:

> National policy making is inevitably a process of "bricolage"; a constant process of borrowing and copying bits and pieces of ideas from other contexts, of using and improving on local tried and tested approaches, of cannibalizing theories, of research, of adopting trends and fashions, and sometimes of investing in whatever might work. Most policies are fragile, the product of agreements, something that may or may not work.

With this, we seek in Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012), the definition of the concept of interpretation in the sense of recontextualizing, since each institution or group will receive and interpret the same order in different ways, from what they experience. The practice may also have several interpretations: some groups apply it in its entirety and accept what it determines, while others question some of its parts and, thus, propose a new way of looking at a given situation. Besides these, there are groups that do not accept the order and resist it, putting into practice what they themselves determine.

To complement this thought, Oliveira (2005) states that we are controlled and regulated all the time, but in such a subtle way that we do not notice. The current model of regulation of educational policies began because of several reforms that took place in 1990 by developed countries interested in imposing their educational systems on other countries.

In Brazil, according to Oliveira (2005), the studies on the term "regulation" in relation to educational policies are still recent, which is justified by the fact that people do not realize the real intention of the discourse that is passed on as absolute truth by the power agencies, and many times they end up reproducing it due to lack of knowledge of the real intention of this discourse, one of which would be the search for quality in education. This statement is corroborated by Oliveira (2005), once the researcher assumes that we do not know to what extent these practices are products or producers of new educational public policies, which determine which dialogues should be opened to discuss the role of teachers in this new context. The author also reinforces the issue of education as an instrument of social regulation, exercising the management of labor and poverty. This view of regulation is one of the contexts of the evaluation system in force, the SINAES. Thus, we realize that the neoliberal and globalized logic permeates all sectors of society and education is not out of the question, and those who suffer all the consequences are the population.

4 National System for Higher Education Evaluation (SINAES)

A closer look at the Law n. 10.861/04 allows us to perceive two antagonistic conceptions of assessment: one considered formative and emancipatory; the other, of regulation and control, which refers us to the National Course Examination. The presence of different perceptions in the same document is worrisome, because in practice the dubiety allows different subjects, according to their beliefs and intentions, to use the law in a progressive way or in a more controlling way.

Polidori et al. (2006) describe that, to overcome the challenges, SINAES depends on how the original proposal is applied, because if it is in its entirety, as it was elaborated, it will be possible to develop the formative processes using self-evaluation as a basis. For this to happen, it is necessary to seek data from the three pillars to disseminate the culture of evaluation, not being in its original form, to obtain a list to classify the institutions.

For Dias Sobrinho (2008), the evaluation of Brazilian higher education today is being reduced to data and regulation, due to the measures taken by INEP. No longer bringing in itself a construction of reflections on the meaning and significance of knowledge for a social and scientific training, going from education to teaching, the "formative processes are annulled before the quantifiable results", in which the performance is important in the search for indexes to classify the quality of the courses. Although the text of SINAES has represented some progress, what is observed in practice is that many times the universities only meet the demands coming from the MEC by means of forms. The bureaucratization of this act is perceptible, in which most of the data are provided without criteria and without

portraying the reality. Besides, many times nothing is done when faced with situations that require interventions. So, this information becomes just numbers and there is no interference that, concretely, leads to the improvement of education.

> Institutional assessment, which was central to SINAES, becomes peripheral. The CPAs lose their function, as institutions are discouraged from conducting evaluation processes. ENADE and the student become the main sources of information for the formulation of quality indexes. The main "owners" and recipients are the government agencies. The main concepts are efficiency, competitiveness, performativity. The most important objectives are to control, hierarchize, compare, rank. (...) INEP dismissed institutional evaluation and erected ENADE - now a static and summative examination, no longer dynamic and formative - as the center of its evaluation, giving it much more weight than it had before. This is not a simple change in methodology. It is, rather, 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, 2008, p. 821).

Thus, we are facing a system that, even with all the contradictory issues of its elaboration, in principle, had everything to work out, however, when it was put into practice, it was not developed as it should have been. It is worth mentioning that this is not only a problem of this particular system, because others (Program of Institutional Evaluation of Brazilian Universities (PAIUB), conceived and implemented from 1993 by the academic community with the appropriate coordination of the Secretariat of Higher Education (SESU), and the National Exam of Courses (ENC), which appeared two years after the PAIUB, designed to assess the knowledge and skills obtained by students in undergraduate courses) that have been implemented have also not had the final objective achieved. Today, in the scenario of a dismantling of education in which we are living, there will be no interest in promoting and developing situations that involve issues of reflection, questioning or critical thinking.

5 Method

The study adopted an epistemological-historical-dialectical perspective with a qualitative approach, based on the importance of the research object to be studied and on its analysis in a broader way, understanding the reality in which it is inserted. This approach

> [...] works with the universe of meanings, motives, aspirations, beliefs, values, and attitudes. This set of human phenomena is understood here as part of social reality, because the human being is distinguished not only for acting, but for thinking about what he does and interpreting his actions within and from the reality experienced and shared with his peers (MINAYO, 2009, p. 21).

Qualitative work, for Flick (2004), needs to take into consideration the researcher-field relationship. Moreover, as the work also involves the subjectivity of these people because it deals with issues related to professional, personal and often emotional of each individual, it is necessary to take care that their feelings are preserved and given real value not only to what is said. We cannot forget to highlight what is implicit and can only be

understood, in fact, from a greater knowledge about the individual and about what he brings to the job, beyond exact data.

After an exploratory phase of mapping the university sectors responsible for the evaluation theme, an extensive literature review on the theme, and the analysis of documents related to the evaluation policy of higher education in Brazil, the collection of empirical data was conducted through interviews with key informants of the evaluation practice at UFRJ. All interviews were semi-structured, with questions about the evaluation theme, in which the focus was on how the texts and laws of the policies were related to the practice of the sectors, as well as how they responded to the demands coming from the evaluation system.

Six interviews were conducted, two with members of the institutional organs of UFRJ responsible for the evaluation theme and four with directors of units that offer undergraduate courses:

i) Team from the Institutional Research Center (NPI) of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, this was the first interview, conducted collectively with three members of the NPI team. The objective was to better understand how evaluation was developed at UFRJ, since we had difficulty in finding data on the university's website. With the data from this interview, it was possible to resize the following interviews. This group showed us the various phases of ENADE and gave us an overview of how the evaluation works at the university.

ii) Representative of the Comissão Própria de Avaliação (CPA) of the Centro de Ciências da Saúde of the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. The interview was held with a member of the CPA at CCS, who is directly connected to the dean of this center. The CPA representative interviewed allowed us to better understand how the CPA works at the university and, especially, the challenges it faces to develop its work at the Center for Health Sciences;

iii) Management of the four oldest units of the Health Sciences Center (CCS) at UFRJ that offer undergraduate courses in medicine, dentistry, nutrition, and nursing.

a. Director of the School of Medicine: has held the position for more than seven years. The interview was held in his office. The director proved to be aware of the evaluation policies and the need for some interference within the university, referring to the data that are in the systems and to which we have no access, as well as the lack of monitoring of the evaluations, not only of the course, but also of the institution itself and the employees themselves. He also argued the difficulty of evaluating because it is a subject that affects the ego of professionals and because it is a movement that brings up many conflicts among professors, departments, and even units of the university.

b. Director of the School of Dentistry: She was head of department for six years and has been in the position of director since July 2018. She showed a lot of concern about the issue of evaluation, not only of UFRJ as a whole, but also the more specific issue of

undergraduate courses, and what to do to be able to evaluate and have feedback of the data obtained, because she considers that communication between the sectors of the university could be better.

c. Director of the AnnaNery School of Nursing: She has been in the direction of the school twice, at the beginning of the 1990s and then as vice-director, at the beginning of 2000. She has been an INEP evaluator since 2007. She showed to be overly concerned about the evaluation theme at UFRJ and provided us with data to understand, for example, the position of the evaluator when making an on-site visit and the difference between making this kind of visit and having your course evaluated. She also explained which the demands are necessary for the evaluation process and how they occur at UFRJ;

d. Director of the Josué de Castro Nutrition Institute: She has held the positions of department head, undergraduate coordinator, and reached the direction in July 2018. She discussed the objective conditions that hinder the evaluation process at UFRJ and, because she had already been a coordinator, she also revealed valuable information regarding her experience with the theme of evaluation in the daily practice of undergraduate coordination.

For data analysis, we used the Content Analysis proposed by Bardin (2004), because it is a method that enables the organization and analysis of information in a systematic way, aiming to describe attitudes and experiences of individuals linked to the context of enunciation, as well as inferences about the data collected, and perceptions about a particular object and its phenomena. Besides allowing us to get to know social processes of certain groups that are still little revealed, it also makes it possible to create innovative approaches, review and create new concepts and categories during the development of the work.

The choice of this method is justified by the need to overcome uncertainties - consequences of the hypotheses and assumptions to enrich the reading- by understanding the meanings and unveiling the relationships that are established beyond the speeches themselves (BARDIN, 2004). Content Analysis is an in-depth reading of a given theme, seeking relationships between the content of the speech and the external aspects, i.e., it occurs from the observation of the relationship between what the interviewees' speech proposes with what is being researched and studied by others, enabling, through this technique, its understanding, use and application in each content.

6 Discussion of results

The results from the analysis of the empirical data from the interviews were organized into five dimensions of analysis i) Relations between neoliberalism, globalization, and higher education; ii) Characteristics of university reforms and educational policies in Brazil; iii) The diversity of the multiple approaches on assessment; iv) The National

Assessment System in Higher Education in practice; v) Challenges in the assessment practices at UFRJ.

To organize, problematize, criticize, and ground the discussion from these dimensions listed above, we used concepts previously presented in the theoretical framework. It is worth mentioning that we chose not to identify the interview subjects to protect their identities and ensure anonymity.

6.1 Relations between neoliberalism, globalization, and higher education

In a current context of hegemony of neoliberalism that brings public policies aimed at the minimum state and the privatization of education, as well as the social, cultural, and educational scenarios, with the objective of devaluing the public sectors. Through this process, situations happen such as budget cuts and prohibition of contests, which lead to social chaos and justify the privatization of the institutions. One interviewee shows exactly this reality when he states his opinion that the law theoretically focuses on improving the quality of education, but in practice, the process does not happen this way.

> We must be always thinking and evaluating our institutions in order to improve. This is the feeling that evaluation policies ask for when bringing their focus to the improvement and quality of education (Unit Director).

This is the discourse that makes individuals believe that, in fact, the policies have the real intention of improving the quality of education. Since this is a particular desire and an internalized truth, individuals end up reproducing it. However, the next speech of the same interviewee presents a different view from the one observed so far:

> In the CCS we are a world, we would have to have a large, expanded commission that is not only concerned with ENADE, only with producing reports to respond to MEC's evaluation. We would need a body that could be discussing all the time the quality of education in all the faculties, schools, institutes, and health services that we have. The CEG itself, which is a very important organ of articulation, ends up being very bureaucratic. [Even the CONSUNI often becomes a bureaucratic operator too, they only talk about the processes of a, b, c. We need to discuss better who we are, what we want, where we are going. We need to better qualify the debate in all these collegiate bodies (Unit Director).

Through this speech, we can identify the recontextualization of evaluation policies, from which the evaluation and the bodies responsible for it come to be seen as purely bureaucratic, made to meet the demands coming from an external policy. Faced with the lack of discussions and questioning about the current reality of the institutions, with the lack of in-depth diagnoses that allow for effective action, there is no real investigation about what is considered important by everyone in the process. It is possible to see the difficulty found when applying the law. When it is theorized, one has the perspective that everything will occur as planned, but, once in contact with reality, it is necessary to make the necessary changes to adapt it.

According to Sousa-Santos (2011), the university cannot be seen as a sector of the economy that provides educational services, nor can it have an industrial bias. Although much is studied and talked about the university, there is no considerable number of research on institutional self-evaluation. More than having data to meet the demands coming from an external evaluation system, it is necessary to understand the weaknesses and strengths that have been identified. The word "evaluation" brings insecurity and, thus, to be subjected to external evaluations, it is necessary to be able to question them. They are not self-criticisms made by people who know each other and, therefore, can argue their flaws.

From this same perspective, Carvalho et al. (2014) state that, currently, the principle of internationalization has been one of the ways to integrate and articulate the university in the globalized world. The institution that aims to be inserted in this context must know these two movements, as well as the evaluative criteria proposed by them. The influence of this economic, political, and ideological conjuncture is called, in the United States, "academic capitalism"; in Europe, "homogenization of Higher Education"; in Latin America, "commodification" of Public Higher Education.

6.2 Characteristics of university reforms and educational policies in Brazil

Considering the above context, we will talk about the educational reforms and other educational policies that result from them. Many questions are raised, including the administrative issues that arise from these changes. It was possible to identify that many of the interviewees are unaware of these reforms or do not believe in the efficacy and effectiveness of education policies. One interviewee tells us about the UFRJ:

> I see evaluation policies still being developed in a very insipient way at UFRJ. I do not see big calls for collective discussions about evaluation processes. I think this is a failure. All the time several courses at UFRJ are being evaluated by MEC, they are undergoing an evaluation process, they need information regarding their own internal evaluation, and they don't have this. So,I think that there is a lack of calls within the university for this collective discussion, for the elaboration of evaluation documents by units and in general, because there are general questions from the university that need to be evaluated and I think they are very important, but there needs to be feedback. This is also a big knot in our structure. It is the lack of feedback of what is done (Unit Director).

Given this report, we can identify that assessment policies come in an imposed manner, without the active participation of those involved, who, in turn, do not feel part of the process and, therefore, treat it as just another demand to be answered. In relation to the instruments used, many times they do not meet the reality that they are evaluating and become just a verification mechanism, to respond to the data requested by higher bodies, to classify and rank the institutions.

To exemplify this issue, the prominence given to ENADE - now as a static and summative instrument, less dynamic and formative - changes the evaluation paradigm and brings important consequences. As a result, the SINAES loses much of its sense of system;

the institutional assessment is weakened and bureaucratized; the institutional and teaching autonomy tends to disappear before the need to obtain a good position on the rating scale, which is achievable through the mechanism of teaching for the exam, according to the model of the test; ENADE abandons the dynamic conception and empties its sense of feedback and the possibility of monitoring student learning (DIAS SOBRINHO, 2010, p. 216).

Teixeira and Rios (2017) indicate what should be done before the results of an evaluation process: The final product of the entire evaluation process would not be a ranking, but descriptive reports of the institutions, which would subsidize decision making of educational managers, public and private. Ultimately, the goal should be to foster a permanent culture of evaluation (and self-evaluation) within the institutions, seeking to undo the stigma of audit and punishment (TEIXEIRA; RIOS, 2017, p. 798). It is clear in our data that even with reforms and educational policies, being implemented and renewed, if there is not in fact a culture of evaluation, if there was no interest on the part of those who apply these policies, the goal is not achieved. As we can see, there is a difference between what is thought and how it is put into practice.

The issue of having an evaluation culture already happens in two universities in Brazil, as brought by the study of Magalhães and Rodrigues (2016) and Nunes Eussen (2010), when showing the case study of the University of Rio Grande do Norte and Rio de Grande do Sul. It is a challenge that is posed to an evaluation model that is intended to be participatory and democratic, but we have seen that this already occurs in other institutions. It is not easy, but it is necessary in order to have a more significant effect. With this, the teachers and professionals involved would feel part of the process and would not see it as something punitive or as just a demand that has to be met, as many pointed out in the interviews. And this is a feeling that was also observed in other moments during this study.

For this very reason, bringing to our work the study by Saul (1985) about emancipatory, democratic, critical evaluation, in which it is possible to build an evaluation process, in which a reality is transformed by means of a description, critical analysis in a conscious way with the actual participation of those involved, since they will be parts of this process, is the differential for this construction of the evaluation culture in the university as a whole, whether institutionally, in the courses or in the disciplines. Therefore, seeing evaluation in a different way changes the way we act and think about the subject. But, on the other hand, some texts from the literature review (MAGALHÃES; RODRIGUES, 2016, and NUNES EUSSEN, 2010) that address the change in the way of looking at evaluation in some institutions. Such studies have shown that the institutions that have sought the evaluation culture, no longer see the process as punishment, but rather as an instrument of diagnosis and institutional change. The goal, in this sense, is to improve quality, from the disciplines to the filling out of the MEC forms, to logistics, infrastructure, as an involvement of the entire academic community.

6.3 *The diversity of multiple approaches to evaluation*

When we talk about evaluation, many are the feelings involved and many are the approaches to the same concept, since every concept is dynamic and undergoes changes based on cultural, social, economic, or political issues. It is this mix of feelings that we find in our interviewees as well:

> When we talk about evaluation, the word evaluation is scary. When you are in the role of someone who composes an evaluation committee, then, automatically, you are perceived as an external evaluator. People think that the evaluation committee will come to point out mistakes, to say that everything is wrong, when the function of the Commission for Self-Evaluation is not this (CPA).

It is also possible to conclude based on our results that, since there is no evaluation culture, talking about being evaluated is difficult, because it relates to our emotional and status. Because of this, many forms of boycotts occur, aiming to prevent the evaluation from taking place and the facts reported in it from interfering in a negative way for the people involved. Few people actually understand evaluation as something positive that can help improve the whole teaching-learning process, in its broadest sense, since it is not restricted only to the teacher-student relationship, but to all the people who are part of this universe, including the course, the center, and the university itself.

We bring the thought of Teixeira et al. (2013) when raising the need to review the concept of assessment, because it should not be restricted only to measure the performance of students and institutions, but also to consider the context in which the assessment is inserted, emphasizing its social construction and its formative character. The models for evaluating institutions have been harshly criticized for making use only of items that take technical and political data into consideration in their process. On these issues, Saul (1985) states that the authoritarian mark that characterizes educational evaluation in the classical paradigms has driven the search for a new paradigm that is based on three theoretical and methodological strands: democratic evaluation, institutional critique for collective creation, and participant research.

Perrenoud (1999) also addresses this problem when he says that one of the most traditional conceptions of evaluation refers to the possibility of classifying and comparing performance by virtue of external standards that, many times, are distant and out of touch with the reality of that group or institution. The so-called classificatory evaluation is related to the product demonstrated.

> Nobody likes to be evaluated, evaluation is always intimidating, but the evaluation culture needs to be further developed in our University. It is also important to emphasize that it cannot only have a punitive character. "Oh, I'm going to be evaluated, they're going to criticize me, and with that I'm going to have some sanctions, some penalties." And, yes, in the sense of evaluation, always seeking an improvement of the work and a correction of directions (Unit Director).

Besides the issue of ego and punishment, we are also faced with the ignorance about what is done with the data obtained from the evaluations. We know that most of the time, the data does not come back in order to verify the failures and the successes and to make the necessary changes. They are often used as a tool for regulation and power.

> On the other hand, there is the responsibility of the one who is evaluating. What to do with the results of this evaluation? How do you place yourself in the power relationship that is established? (Unit Director)

It was also possible to identify that besides this mixture of feelings, some have the theoretical vision of evaluation as a process, but, however, in practice this is very difficult to happen due to several factors of the day to day, in addition, they mentioned the importance of it for the effectiveness of the results. However, many of them do not know, in fact, how to put into practice and how to act with data presented and how this information gathered will be used, leading to insecurity.

6.4 *The National System for Evaluation in Higher Education in practice*

When talking about evaluation policies, we cannot fail to mention SINAES, the system that is currently in effect. It was possible to identify that most of the interviewees do not know it or, when they say otherwise, they identify only parts of its process. There were more technical statements, indicating how the system works, as well as criticisms of it.

The lack of knowledge about the national evaluation system, as a whole, appeared in the interviewees' statements, as was the case of the health unit director who said, about SINAES, that he had heard about it, but knew very little about how it worked. The lack of communication was another factor mentioned by some interviewees. This lack of communication is reported both with agencies external to UFRJ and inside it as well. The researcher also had this difficulty in accessing data about the evaluation, whether at the university or at the supervisory body of SINAES itself.

> We, from the CPA, have many difficulties in accessing information from the courses. The CPA sends to all UFRJ a simplified questionnaire to collect data, but, as the courses do not know what this commission is, the coordinators did not answer, and this did not happen. In reality, the CPA doesn't even have a room, the meetings take place in several different places, where a room can be scheduled. The CPA would have to have a room, stay in some space, this lack of logistics ends up hindering communication and dissemination of the work (CPA).

The visibility and importance of the CPA is something that was mentioned, but it was possible to perceive, from the interviewees' statements, that it is a subject that is rarely addressed. There is no relationship between the CPA and the courses, and this is fundamental for the evaluation process to have an efficient result. And it is also possible to notice that the CPA itself perceives that it does not have the necessary visibility, justified by the issue of overload of functions and the difficulty of returning data.

Just as we have a vision of the need to have an APC, it was possible to verify some criticism of its functioning at UFRJ.

> The real function of the CPA, in practice, ends up being to fill out forms to send to SINAES, that is what we do. Unfortunately, it ends up being just that. We have no way to problematize and end up accepting as truth everything that is reported, there is no real verification. I hope it changes, that they have a different look at this function. Because it is extremely important as it positions the evaluation of UFRJ at a national level (CPA).

It can be seen, therefore, that a role as important as that of the CPA ends up being seen and done only in a bureaucratic way, meeting demands coming from outside the institution and failing to fulfill its essential role, to actually evaluate the institution.

Another subgroup mentioned was ENADE, where we had more technical discussions about how it works in general and how it occurs at UFRJ, as well as questions about the results and effectiveness of the evaluation. Most of the coordinators do not understand how this procedure happens; they just fill out what is sent, without having a notion of the responsibility before INEP.

> We don't have a fluid communication with MEC. The evaluators of ENADE and the coordination end up being very distant. The coordination receives the guidelines, organizes itself so that the students attend, there is a previous evaluation questionnaire that they fill out for ENADE, but, in fact, we have no return for the course (Unit director).

Once again, the lack of communication between the agencies appeared as a factor that hinders the assessment, as well as the relations between the coordinators and the person responsible for ENADE at the university. In relation to ENADE, the difficulty in motivating was mentioned, unlike in private universities, which carry out actions for studies for ENADE. Besides this, there is the boycott of the test as a form of protest, which demonstrates the fragility of the evaluation, because the data is analyzed coldly, without taking into consideration if this was a form of resistance to the system or if those students really do not have the required capabilities. Thus, the instrument is not credible, because it does not portray what actually occurs in the courses, indicating only the data obtained after the test, without having, however, the vision of what happens in the institutions and what could often justify that data.

6.5 *Challenges of evaluation practice at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro*

So far, we have talked about evaluation in a more general way, but we could not fail to analyze how the interviewees perceive evaluation in the concrete institutional practice at UFRJ. According to them, there are several universities within one, and there are many variables, such as several units in different locations, among other factors, which make it multiple. The statements below portray this reality, which is possible to verify, since each campus has its autonomy and, therefore, several faces of UFRJ can emerge.

> UFRJ is a diversity. I get worried, for example, about an evaluation model to be developed. Will we ever manage to develop a single evaluation model? I think it is practically impossible to have something unique for all the centers, because the centers are autonomous, and the university is very diverse. The evaluation process is even greater precisely because of this diversity and the difficulty in establishing what exactly needs to be evaluated in each center, in each unit. But honestly, I think this is very positive, I really don't think we should adopt single solutions in an arbitrary way (Unit director).

Another point raised by the interviewees on the issue of assessment at UFRJ is that there is no discussion about assessment, since this practice is not recognized in the courses and neither in a more general way, i.e., by the institutional assessment. It would be interesting to see this discourse being reviewed, as all interviewees mentioned this need and its importance.

> Evaluation of UFRJ as an institution is inefficient, it does not exist. There were some initiatives in the CPA, but they did not go ahead, we didn't receive the results of that lot of data that we had to pass on. I remember that, at one time, there was even an evaluation of the professors, but this ended. Because the 15 people also started to get very offended. Because the evaluation also has a more political side. There is a lot of criticism of the teachers in relation to this and that, but the student is not evaluated beyond the contents of the subjects. Can't they be evaluated? Can't the technicians be evaluated? I think that in this part everything is very loose at the UFRJ (Director of a health unit).

Evaluation, like every other act, is political, and if it is not seen as something positive, it has its image distorted and ends up being a negative point. For this reason, speeches of comparison end up being made and serve as justification for the evaluation not to occur, instead of the opposite. If it were an instrument seen as part of the educational process, such statements would not exist, because everyone would be evaluated and everyone would be willing to help in the improvement of education and teaching.

In this sense, we use the ideas of Dias Sobrinho (1996) when determining that institutional assessment must be based on its pedagogical essence, seek that relationships, whether inter or intra-personal, happen in the best possible way, look at the university as a network when integrating actions from the micro to the macro, in addition to having data that enable the interaction between the university and the system.

There is a lot of talk about the difficulty of evaluating at UFRJ, whether due to lack of communication, lack of feedback, or even because the evaluation process affects the ego of some professionals. The difficulty of change is also admitted in people who have been facing a specific reality for a long time changing it causes strangeness and refusal. Even the people who are newer to the institution also have a negative view of evaluation and do not find in the university a discussion or a greater involvement on the subject. The difficulty in evaluating and the maintenance of this traditional view is a sign of resistance to change, which exists precisely because evaluation has a negative connotation. Many know that it is necessary to

change the form of evaluation, but when we go into practice, we see that this discourse is not maintained.

7 Conclusions

In general, there are many challenges in evaluating educational processes, and it is no different in higher education. The issue of the perception of evaluation as a regulatory or punitive instrument, besides the fact that evaluation is not built in a truly participatory way, are the main challenges to be faced. Another relevant aspect is the deficiency of the evaluation processes in sharing the data and working the results in a way to provide concrete improvements in education. As they are used to classify courses, rank the institutions, and justify the implementation of managerialist models, most of the time the evaluations in higher education do not meet the real demands of the subjects that experience the daily life of educational institutions, whether they are managers, teachers or students.

In the scope of this study, the challenges materialized, from the beginning, in the difficulty in gaining access to key sectors of the university responsible for institutional assessment, especially the CPA, which should be a participatory space, of public access, since it is the commission responsible for the capillarization of demands related to institutional assessment. It is, therefore, visible that the theme of evaluation brings fear, insecurity, and other negative feelings to the people involved in the educational process, and one reason for this may be the lack of a culture of participation in the institutional evaluation processes. In general, this causes the evaluation to be identified as a negative instrument, in which the data are not analyzed to seek improvement for education, but only for management and control instruments, thus resulting in a great resistance to evaluation practices.

The analysis of these challenges previously mentioned involves knowing how the university works, how the data are collected and analyzed, and how the information is returned to the subjects involved. Throughout the research, the verification that the data referring to institutional assessment are used, most of the time, only to meet administrative demands, such as those coming from the MEC or to fill out the fields required in the management reports of the units or in the reports on the functional progression of professors, was one of the aspects that stood out the most in the set of interviews. At the beginning of the study, there were many questions about how the evaluation public policies happened in practice at UFRJ. We didn't know if there was a specific sector responsible for this topic; how evaluation was perceived by the managers and professors at the university; in addition to questions about the internal operation of the higher education evaluation system in the institution.

It is also necessary to make the caveat that the period of this study coincided with numerous political conflicts arising from the coup d'état of 2016, which interrupted the regime of democracy in Brazil, causing great instability not only in the internal environment of the university, but also in the Ministry of Education itself and throughout the authoritarian

government that succeeded the coup. Certainly, the difficulty in obtaining information is also related to the broader social and political issues that led the country to significant conflicts in multiple sectors of society, with emphasis on the undervaluation of the themes of Education and Health, a situation that persists until today.

It is therefore understandable that the theme of evaluation arouses fear, insecurity, and other negative feelings among the people involved in the educational process, and one reason for this may be the lack of a culture of participation in institutional evaluation processes. This logic is characterized by Ball (2005) as a neoliberal management technology that feeds the selfish feeling and competition among educational workers, being necessary to produce increasingly to maintain the social status of researcher and the accreditation in graduate programs. How can one do research and not bring up this context that falls directly on education, the students, the employees, and the society where the university is inserted?

This reality of the commodification of higher education does not reside only in the Brazilian context but is a global problem. Giroux (2018) states that neoliberal fascism encourages authoritarian logic and treats education as a commodity. Thus, it constitutes a political, economic, and social issue that shows an unequal, selfish, and extremely competitive society, installing in the practice of higher education institutions what Ball (2005), calls the culture of performativity. This culture changes the nature of the relationships among teachers, contributing to their being guided not by solidarity, but by competition. There is an intense search for an expressive number of publications, for invitations to events and other academic activities, besides this performance being associated with the amount of funds for research, number of students and scholars, and prominence in the academic scenario of the country - all this changes the way of seeing education.

This critical scenario reveals the challenges of a society that lives ideological conflicts regarding the future of its education practices and policies and the imposition of a capitalist, ultra-neoliberal, and globalized project. According to Giroux (2018), the deterioration of democratic values and the implementation of an authoritarian regime, with characteristics of a "neoliberal fascism explains many issues if we assume that higher education, and its evaluation methods, are inserted in this broader context. Only within this context characterized by Giroux (2019) as a machine of destruction of imagination and critical thinking, it is possible to understand why there is so much hatred for public educational institutions, so many cuts in funding for public education, and the implementation of so many control mechanisms. This reality does not reside only in the Brazilian context but is a global problem. Giroux (2018) states that neoliberal fascism stimulates the authoritarian logic and treats education as a commodity.

Given this scenario, it is possible to verify the mismatch between what is done in the daily reality of the institution and the formal discourse present in the forms tends to grow even more. Thus, what Ball (2011) calls "context of practice" in the policy cycle, tends to assume an increasing relevance in studies on educational policies and, more specifically, in studies on evaluation, because it is in the context of practice in which subjects

"recontextualize" the policy and operationalize it in reality. The gap between the official text and the praxis is exactly the most fertile space for the forces of resistance, although this resistance is not always done in an intentionally explicit way.

Through the field research, it was possible to identify that there is little discussion about the theme of evaluation at UFRJ as an institutional movement. There are even sectors that work with evaluation, but these are always doing a bureaucratic job, since data is requested and there is no feedback on the information produced about them. The evaluation instruments are imposed from the top down and are filled out only to meet external demands related to the national higher education evaluation system.

Regarding the evaluation processes implemented internally in the university, we observe that they also establish a vertical, top-down discourse, not being seen, as Saul (1985) says, as a collective, democratic, and participatory construction. If this vision becomes something that is part of the process, in which individuals also feel part of it, this search for an improvement for the institution can occur. Therefore, to have arguments and data against this system, which often only classifies and regulates, it is necessary to have models of self-evaluation and self-management that are made in a participatory way.

SINAES, the main instrument of the evaluation policy in effect, is not known in its entirety by the course managers, which was proven by the interviews. Only some parts of SINAES were mentioned by the directors, such as ENADE, however, the speeches clearly reveal the enormous difficulties concerning the practice.

On the other hand, the lack of access to data, and the non-publication of information concerning the evaluation at the university make this discussion increasingly distant from the daily lives of unit managers and, especially, of professors. It is also difficult to access information and the people responsible for the institutional evaluation sectors, making it impossible for the courses themselves to access the ENADE data. It was evident in our results that the evaluation instruments are unable to reveal what in fact happens in the courses, and in many of them there is also a boycott of the exams by the students, as a conscious form of resistance.

Since there is only one stage of written evaluation by the students - or when there is some diligence on the part of INEP - it is often difficult to compare the reality of public universities against the physical structure and lobby of private universities. Many evaluators cannot understand the dynamics of public universities, much less realize that the difficulties in the relationship with INEP are often a form of resistance and struggle against private interests. This tension between the public function of universities and the market logic of private universities was very explicit in the interview with NPI and reveals the enormous disputes of interest that are behind the official results about the evaluation processes in higher education.

It was possible to perceive that the theme of evaluation is increasingly distant from the practical reality of the public university. The information obtained is only for classifying and regulating education. In summary, the SINAES is not effective for the evaluation of the real quality of education, although it is useful for organizing statistical data regarding the structure and offer of higher education in Brazil. The centralization of the evaluation processes around a single national system does not contribute to the improvement of the quality of education; on the contrary, it often reinforces stigmas, sustains prejudices, and makes participatory and local models of reflection on the educational process within universities unfeasible. It is thus evident that the practice of evaluation at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro is often made unfeasible by the very bureaucratization promoted by the system, making it difficult to build evaluation models that show the real problems of the institution and that can inform future planning.

Another aspect worth considering according to the interviewees' statements is the inexistence of a sector that deals specifically with evaluation the way we believe it should be with diagnosis and feedback to all the instances involved. The sectors that work with evaluation are currently focused on meeting the demands coming from external bodies, for example, the forms sent by the MEC to the CPAs or the discipline forms that are filled out by the system, but do not have a return for the courses. Thus, it was possible to verify that there is no work being done to meet what is written in the text of the law that implements SINAES, whose objective would be the improvement of the quality of education. What we identified, in practice, are people answering forms whose objective is not explicit and whose information is rarely returned to those who generate the data, hindering any more substantial change based on a true diagnosis.

It is concluded, therefore, that the evaluation system, as it is being put into practice, does not achieve its objective of improvement and quality of education. Currently, what exists is a mechanism that aims to classify and regulate the institutions by means of their evaluation instruments. The sectors that work with evaluation are currently focused on meeting the demands coming from external bodies, for example, the forms sent by the MEC to the CPAs or the discipline forms that are filled out by the system, but do not have a return for the courses. There is no work being done to meet what is written in the text of the law that implements SINAES, whose objective would be the improvement of the quality of education. What we see, in practice, are people answering forms, whose objective is not explicit and whose information is rarely returned to those who generate the data, hindering any more substantial change based on a true diagnosis.

This is a challenge to an evaluation model that pretends to be participatory and democratic, in the face of the current government, strongly militarized and with a discourse that promotes hate and meritocracy, makes it difficult to implement more participatory and democratic processes inside the institutions of higher education. We cannot disregard that in several public institutions, since the beginning of the Bolsonaro government, professors are under permanent surveillance, numerous rectors elected by the university community could

not take office, being replaced by intervenors, and that, therefore, all the data and information from evaluation processes become even more sensitive - and, perhaps, the institutions are right to deal with the issue bureaucratically, resisting the filling out of forms and the sending of information.

At this point, it is worth recalling the study by Demo (1987) with his definition of quality in education, when he strategically highlights two main dimensions. The first is formal quality, meaning the ability to manage means, instruments, forms, techniques, and procedures. The second, in turn, is political quality, highlighting the competence of the subject in terms of making and making history. When these two dimensions are evoked, one notices the contrast with the current reality, in which the political quality is not being put into practice, because, if it were, we would have data on the reality of each institution and, thus, it would be possible to question and criticize what would be published. We would have, then, not only unrealistic information filled in to meet the demands imposed by the official text. If the dimension of political quality were actively worked on, we would be able to have a real picture of the daily challenges.

It is urgent to start a cultural revolution in the way of seeing the university and also the way of seeing evaluation, which should be seen as something constructive, as Saul (1985) says "emancipatory", where everyone involved is part of the process, which is part of a collective construction for the transformation of the social reality and of the subjects involved. We know that major transformations do not happen suddenly, because there is a need to reform habits that have been perpetuated in the university for many years. Within this context, power, and status, which many have, can suffer interference. For this reason, some people often prefer that evaluation be a matter for discussion. We hope that this and other works dealing with evaluation in higher education will bring new possibilities for discussion and, at the same time, may contribute to the improvement of the educational, management, and political process in public universities.

References

BALL, Stephen John. Diretrizes políticas globais e relações políticas locais em educação. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**. v. 1, n. 2, p. 99-116, July./Dec, 2001. ISSN 1645-1384. Avaliable on: http://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol1iss2articles/ball.pdf. Access on: 15 Jan. 2018.

BALL, Stephen John; MAGUIRE, Meg; BRAUN, Anette**. How Schools do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools**. New York: Routledge, 2012. ISBN 9780429228803

BALL, Stephen John. Sociologia das políticas educacionais e pesquisa crítico-social: uma revisão pessoal das políticas educacionais e da pesquisa em política educacional. *In*: BALL, S. J.; MAINARDES, J. (org.). **Políticas educacionais:** questões e dilemas. São Paulo: Cortez, p. 21-53, 2011. Avaliable on:

https://biblat.unam.mx/hevila/CurriculosemFronteiras/2006/vol6/no2/2.pdf. Access em: 5 Jan. 2018

BALL, S. John. Profissionalismo, gerencialismo e performatividade. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 35, n. 126, p. 539-564, Sept./Dec. 2005. Avaliable on: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-15742005000300002. Access on: 01 Feb. 2018.

BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de Conteúdo**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2004. ISBN 9789724411545

BRASIL. Lei n. 9394, de 20 dezembro de 1996. **Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Brasileira**. BRASIL. Lei n. 10.861, de 14 de abril de 2004. Institui o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior — SINAES e dá outras providências. Avaliable on: https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/70320/65.pdf. Access on: 24 Nov. 2017

CARVALHO, Agenor. Manoel. et al. A gestão da educação superior no Brasil frente aos instrumentos de avaliação e regulação: burocracia ou eficácia? *In*: **Colóquio Internacional de Gestão Universitária**, 14., 2014, Florianópolis. Anais. Florianópolis: INPEAU, 2014. Avaliable on: https://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/handle/123456789/132045. Access on: 26 July. 2017.

DEMO, Pedro. **Avaliação Qualitativa**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1987. ISBN 9786588717691

DIAS SOBRINHO, José. Qualidade, Avaliação: do SINAES a Índices. **Avaliação**. Campinas. v. 13, n. 3, p. 817-825, Nov. de 2008. Avaliable on: http://periodicos.uniso.br/ojs/index.php/avaliacao/article/view/284. Access on: 01 Feb. 2019.

DIAS SOBRINHO, José. Avaliação institucional: marcos teórico e políticos. **Avaliação**. Campinas, v. 1, n. 1, p. 15-24, July 1996. Avaliable on: http://periodicos.uniso.br/ojs/index.php/avaliacao/article/view/722. Access on: 04 Feb. 2019.

DIAS SOBRINHO, José. Avaliação e transformações da educação superior brasileira (1995-2009): do provão ao Sinaes. **Avaliação**. Campinas, v. 15, n. 1, p. 195-224, 2010. Avaliable on: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1414-40772010000100011&lng=en&nrm=iso. Access on: 06 Feb. 2019.

FLICK, Uwe. **Uma introdução à pesquisa qualitativa**. São Paulo: Bookman, 2004. ISBN 9788536304144

GESSER, Verônica.; RANGHETTI, Diva. Spezia. **Currículo Escolar:** das concepções histórico epistemológicas a sua materialização na prática dos contextos escolares. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2011. ISBN 9788580422405

GIROUX, Henry. Armand. **American nightmare: facing the challenge of fascism**. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2018. ISBN 9780872867536

GIROUX, Henry. Armand. **Terror of the Unforeseen. Los Angeles**: LARB Provocations, 2019. ISBN 9781940660493

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza (org.). **Pesquisa Social:** teoria, método e criatividade. 28. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2009. ISBN 9788526295230

MOREIRA, Antônio. Flávio. A cultura da performatividade e a avaliação da pós-graduação em educação no Brasil. **Educação em Revista**. Belo Horizonte, v. 25, n. 3, p. 23-42. Dec. 2009.

OLIVEIRA, Dalila Andrade. Regulação das políticas educacionais na América Latina e suas consequências para os trabalhadores docentes. **Educação e Sociedade**. Campinas, vol. 26, n. 92, p. 753- 775. 2005. Avaliable on: https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302005000300003. Access on: 03 May 2017.

POLIDORI, Marlis Morosoni; MARINHO-ARAUJO, Claisy M.; BARREYRO, Gladys Beatriz. **Ensaio:** aval. pol. públ. Educ., Rio de Janeiro, v.14, n. 53, p. 425-436, Oct./Dec. 2006. Avaliable on: https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3995/399537945002.pdf. Access on: 05 May 2017

REAL, Giselle. Cristina. Martins. **Avaliação e qualidade no Ensino Superior**: os impactos do período 1995-2002. Educação e Pesquisa, v. 35, n. 3, p. 573-584, Sept./Dec. 2009. Avaliable on: https://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v35n3/11.pdf. Access em: 03 Sept. 2017.

SAUL, Ana Maria. **Avaliação emancipatória:** desafio à teoria e à prática de avaliação e reformulação de currículo. São Paulo: Cortez, 1985. ISBN 9788524901218

SOUSA-SANTOS, Boaventura. **A universidade no século XXI:** para uma reforma democrática e emancipatória da universidade. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011. ISBN 9788524910593

TEIXEIRA, Luciana. et al. **O processo de avaliação da educação superior no Brasil**: uma abordagem teórica e crítica. In: COLÓQUIO INTERNACIONAL SOBRE GESTÃO UNIVERSITÁRIA NAS AMÉRICAS, 13, 2013. Florianópolis. Anais. Florianópolis: INPEAU. 2013. Avaliable on: https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/114871. Access on: 23 Oct. 2017.

TEIXEIRA JUNIOR, Paulo. Roberto.; RIOS, Monica. Piccione. Gomes. **Dez anos de SINAES**: um mapeamento de teses e dissertações defendidas no período 2004 - 2014. Avaliação, Campinas, v. 22, n. 3, p. 793-816, Dec. 2017. Avaliable on: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S141440772017000300793&lng=en&nrm=iso. Access on: 24 Oct. 2017.

TREVISAN, Monica. de Sousa.; SARTURI, Rosane. Carneiro. **O estado da arte do SINAES**: levantamento de teses e conceitos. In: SIMPÓSIO AVALIAÇÃO DA EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR. Porto Alegre. Anais. Porto Alegre: UFRGS. 2016 Avaliable on: http://www.ufrgs.br/avalies2016/anaisdo-evento/artigos-1/156331.pdf. Access on: 24 Oct. 2017.

UFRJ. **Estatuto Interno da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro**. Atualizado em 28 jun. 2018. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 2018. Avaliable on: www.ufrj.br. Access em: 27 Nov. 2018.