

# Special educational needs are identified within the context of public policies<sup>1</sup>

*Luanna Freitas Johnson<sup>2</sup>*

*Solange Franci Raimundo Yaegashi<sup>3</sup>*

*Aline Arruda Rodrigues da Fonseca<sup>4</sup>*

## ABSTRACT

The identification process of special education needs of students with intellectual deficiency (*deficiência intelectual* - DI) at the Specialized Educational Care (*Atendimento Educacional Especializado* - AEE) is analyzed. For this, we resort to documentary research on legislative and teachers' formation material used by the Ministry of Education. Analysis of the above revealed gaps regarding methodological and theoretical subsidies in the process. Legislation pinpoints teachers' attributions, such as evaluation of needs, elaboration and execution of individual care plan, production of pedagogical material, articulation with other segments, family guidance, and orientation to regular teachers. Furthermore, publications used in teachers' formation do not highlight their instrumentalization. The identification process of students' needs should be supported by theoretical and methodological foregrounding that would give opportunity to the organization of school education for the humanization of students, regardless of their objective conditions.

**KEYWORDS:** Multifunctional Resource room. Assessment of educational needs. Ministry of Education.

---

<sup>1</sup> English version by Leonardo Oliveira Mendes. *E-mail:* [lpjnmendes@gmail.com](mailto:lpjnmendes@gmail.com).

<sup>2</sup> Doutora em Educação. Docente da Universidade Federal de Rondônia (UNIR), Guajará-Mirim, Rondônia, Brasil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1985-7800>. *E-mail:* [luannajohnson@unir.br](mailto:luannajohnson@unir.br).

<sup>3</sup> Doutora em Educação. Docente do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Estadual de Maringá (UEM), Maringá, Paraná, Brasil. Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7666-7253>. *E-mail:* [solangefry@gmail.com](mailto:solangefry@gmail.com).

<sup>4</sup> Doutora em Psicologia Social. Docente do Centro Universitário UNIESP. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5805-2650>. *E-mail:* [alineufpb@hotmail.com](mailto:alineufpb@hotmail.com).

*Identificação das necessidades educacionais especiais no contexto de políticas públicas*

**RESUMO**

O presente artigo tem como objetivo analisar o processo de identificação das necessidades educacionais especiais de estudantes com deficiência intelectual (DI) encaminhados ao Atendimento Educacional Especializado (AEE). Para tanto, recorreremos à pesquisa documental, a partir de marcos legais e materiais de formação docente utilizadas pelo Ministério da Educação. A análise dos elementos evidencia lacunas quanto aos subsídios teórico-metodológicos para subsidiar esse processo. Os marcos legais apontam diversas atribuições do professor, tais como: avaliação das necessidades, elaboração e execução do plano de atendimento individual, produção de materiais pedagógicos, articulação com outros setores, orientação à família e ao professor da sala regular. Por sua vez, as publicações utilizadas na formação docente não promovem sua instrumentalização. Sendo assim, o processo de identificação das necessidades do aluno precisa ser subsidiado por fundamentos teóricos e metodológicos que oportunizem a organização da educação escolar com vistas à humanização do estudante independentemente de suas condições objetivas.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Sala de Recursos Multifuncionais. Avaliação das necessidades educacionais. Ministério da Educação.

*Identificación de necesidades educativas especiales en el contexto de políticas públicas*

**RESUMEN**

Este artículo tiene la obligación de analizar el proceso de identificación de las necesidades educativas especiales de los estudiantes con discapacidad intelectual (DI) referido al Atendimento Educativo Especializado (AEE). Para ello, recurrimos a la investigación documental, basada en marcos legales y materiales de formación docente utilizados por el Ministerio de Educación. El análisis de los elementos muestra brechas en términos de subsidios metodológicos teóricos para apoyar este proceso. Los marcos legales

apuntam a diversas atribuciones del docente, tales como: evaluación de necesidades, elaboración y ejecución del plan de atención individual, producción de materiales pedagógicos, articulación com otros sectores, orientación a la familia y al docente de clase regular. A su vez, las publicaciones utilizadas em la formación del professorado no promueven su instrumentalización. Así, el proceso de identificación de las necesidades del alumno deve apoyarse em fundamentos teóricos y metodológicos que brinden oportunidades para la organización de la educación escolar com miras a humanizar al alumno indepentemente de sus condiciones objetivas.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Clase de Recursos Multifuncionales. Evaluación de necesidades educativas. Ministério da Educação.

\* \* \*

## Introduction

The identification of special educational needs is one of the challenges imposed on teachers who work in Multifunctional Resource Rooms for the development of an individualized care plan and, consequently, for the removal of possible barriers that hinder learning. However, this process presents many controversies both because of the lack of models or instruments and because of the absence of theoretical discussions that support the pedagogical practices used in the assessment for this purpose.

The process of identifying special educational needs is not an attribution that can be developed in a simple way, considering that the act of evaluating involves concepts and practices that can stigmatize and limit learning and development possibilities for the student undergoing evaluation, creating barriers in the school inclusion process. Another warning factor is the risk of standardizing subjective characteristics as something inherent to the student's condition, leading the teacher to draw

up an intervention plan aimed at the specifics of the disability and not at the subject's characteristics.

Thus, the assessment to identify special educational needs has to be supported by well-defined theoretical and methodological assumptions that enable the identification and appreciation of the student's characteristics and needs. However, this item still presents a precarious picture regarding specific theories, methods, and techniques that allow the identification process to consider man as a historical being in permanent construction in a direct relationship with the society in which they are inserted, are constituted and that conceives education as a process that ensures their integral development, enriching them as it gives them conditions to produce knowledge, configuring itself as a place where potentialities can be developed both in individuals without specific needs and in those with disabilities or unique needs.

To carry out the identification of special educational needs, the teacher necessitates being theoretically and methodologically equipped, so that their practice contributes to removing possible barriers to learning. From this perspective, we intend to analyze the educational policies that guide the assessment process to investigate the needs of the student referred to specialized educational care (*atendimento educacional especializado* - AEE).

Given the movement in favor of inclusive education, it is observed that several documents have been prepared to support the inclusion process. However, among the various aspects present in this theme, the identification of special educational needs presents significant gaps that make it impossible a practice that results in effective actions for the organization to meet the specific needs of the student. Therefore, the importance of this analysis lies in the absence of tools to support both the identification process and the pedagogical practice, which may incur a disservice to the student's learning and development process.

For the development of the study, we accessed some legal frameworks, such as the National Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (BRASIL, 2008) and the Operational Guidelines for Specialized Educational Services in Basic Education, Special Education modality (BRASIL, 2009), in addition to materials published by the Ministry of Education to support the training of teachers in the action of identifying special educational needs. We highlight the Module “Assessment to identify special educational needs” from the collection “Knowledge and practices of inclusion” and the issue “Specialized educational assistance for students with intellectual disabilities” from the collection “Special Education from the perspective of School Inclusion”.

This article is divided into three sections. In the first, we highlight, in the legal framework, aspects related to special educational needs such as the structure and functioning of the AEE, target audience, and the attributions of the teacher working in the Multifunctional Resource Room. In the second, we characterize the materials used in teacher training to guide the process of investigating the needs required by students referred to Specialized Educational Service. In the third section, we develop a brief analysis of these materials.

### **The identification of special educational needs and legal frameworks**

The term *special educational needs* was coined in a document internationally known as the Warnock Report, published in 1978. This report presented the results of investigations into Special Education in England and used the concept of special educational needs to avoid pejorative terminologies that called people according to disability rating categories (CARVALHO, 2001).

Nevertheless, the notion of special educational needs came into evidence from the reflexes caused by the World Conference on Special Education, held in Salamanca, Spain, in 1994. The countries that

participated in the event, including Brazil, became signatories of the “Salamanca Statement” (UNESCO, 1994). This statement instructs that the school must serve all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other conditions, and highlights that special educational needs are not restricted to people with disabilities, considering that not all people who have special educational needs have disabilities, while the fact that a person has a disability does not imply a framework of learning difficulties.

As explained above, special educational needs cover all students who may have required, in their student career, some special attention and not just students with disabilities. Thus, under the Salamanca Statement, the term *special needs* was legally introduced in the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education in 1996, in its Chapter V, Art. 58, referring to Special Education students.

However, the National Guidelines for Special Education in Basic Education, established by Resolution no. 02 of 11/09/2001/CNE/CEB (BRASIL, 2001) considered students with special needs those who during the educational process have:

- I - accentuated learning difficulties or limitations in the development process that make it difficult to monitor curricular activities, which are divided into two groups: a) those not linked to a specific organic cause; b) those related to conditions, dysfunctions, limitations, or deficiencies;
- II - communication and signaling difficulties differentiated from other students, requiring the use of applicable languages and codes;
- III - high skills/giftedness, great ease of learning that leads them to master concepts, procedures, and attitudes quickly.

The resolution clarifies that Special Education is intended for such students and aims to ensure school education and the promotion of potential in all stages and modalities of basic education. According to the resolution, the specialized pedagogical support service must be offered to these students. This service can be performed in the common class,

through the activity of Special Education teachers, interpreter teachers, and other professionals such as speech therapists and psychologists and/or in Resource Rooms, being conducted by a Special Education teacher who would have the responsibility to complement or supplement the common class curriculum by using specific equipment and materials.

In 2008, the Ministry of Education (MEC) instituted the National Policy for Special Education from the perspective of Inclusive Education (BRASIL, 2008) with the aim of building policies that promote quality education for all students. This policy sought to promote meeting the special educational needs of a specific audience: students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders, and high abilities/giftedness, with Special Education being indicated as necessary support to include students in regular schools. In this sense, the AEE stands out as one of the main guidelines to complement and/or supplement the education of included students, but it is not a substitute for schooling, as its function is to identify, prepare and organize the resources necessary to eliminate barriers that may prevent student participation in the educational process.

To implement actions that enable the functionality of the AEE, Resolution n.04 CNE/CEB established the Operational Guidelines for Specialized Educational Service in Basic Education, Special Education modality (BRASIL, 2009). In its 5th article, it emphasizes that the AEE must be offered “priority” in the Multifunctional Resource Rooms (*Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais* - SRM) of the school itself or in another regular teaching school or specialized educational service centers. The SRM is then constituted as a space for specialized educational care.

As noted so far, the delimitation of the target audience to be served in the AEE is clear, as well as the definition of the Multifunctional Resource Room as a space to serve these students. This fact leads us to inquire about students who have special educational needs but do not fit into the public established in the legal framework, such as students with Dyslexia and

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. In addition, that the AEE is restricted to the space of the Multifunctional Resource Rooms may cause the segregation of students referred to this service.

Witeze and Silva (2016) criticize the AEE as being restricted only to the work developed in the SRM. For the authors, this restriction actually seems to contain covert and/or more subtle forms of segregation of students with special educational needs (*Necessidades Educacionais Especiais* - NEE), since special classes and schools have been replaced by Resource Rooms, such a situation maintains the exclusion within the regular school.

Another prominent point established in the Guidelines established by Resolution n.04 CNE/CEB (BRASIL, 2009), refers to the competencies and attributions of the SRM teacher. Article 9 establishes that

[...] the preparation and execution of the AEE plan is the responsibility of the teachers who work in the multifunctional resource room or AEE centers, in conjunction with other regular education teachers, with the participation of families and in interface with the other sectoral services of the health, social assistance, among others necessary for the treatment (BRASIL, 2009).

Article 13, in turn, adds a list of assignments of the AEE teacher:

- I – to identify, develop, produce and organize services, pedagogical resources, accessibility, and strategies considering the specific needs of students who are target audience of Special Education;
- II – to prepare and execute a Specialized Educational Service plan, evaluating the functionality and applicability of pedagogical and accessibility resources;
- III – to organize the type and number of student visits to the multifunctional resource room;
- IV – to monitor the functionality and applicability of pedagogical and accessibility resources in the common classroom of regular education, as well as in other school environments;
- V – to establish partnerships with intersectoral areas in the elaboration of strategies and in the availability of accessibility resources;



- VI – to guide teachers and families about the pedagogical and accessibility resources used by the student;
- VII – to teach and use assistive technology in order to expand functional skills of students, promoting autonomy and participation;
- VIII – to establish articulation with teachers in the common classroom, aiming at the provision of services, pedagogical and accessibility resources, and strategies that promote the participation of students in school activities.

The competencies and attributions listed in articles 9 and 13 of the resolution indicate a significant scope of action for the SRM professor. Generally, their work is not only related to identifying and meeting the needs required by the student but goes beyond. It is up to them to establish partnerships with intersectoral areas, to provide advice and guidance to the regular classroom teacher, and to orient the family. It is also assumed that they must master assistive technology not only for its use but so that they can teach about it. Not to mention that they should work with students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders, and high abilities/giftedness.

### **The identification of special educational needs in MEC publications**

When researching the subsidies used in the formation of teachers for the AEE, it was possible to access several materials on the Ministry of Education (MEC) portal. At first, we found six productions published between 2000 and 2010. Of the materials found to support teacher education, we highlight those that present content that meets our theme. They are:

A. Modules of the collection *Knowledge and Inclusion Practices* “Assessment for identification of special educational needs” of the collection “Knowledge and practices of inclusion” (BRASIL, 2006);

B. Fascicle 2 “Specialized educational assistance for students with intellectual disabilities” from the collection “Special Education from the perspective of School Inclusion” (GOMES; POULIN; FIGUEIREDO, 2010).

The module on assessment for identifying special educational needs is part of the *Knowledge and Inclusion Practices* collection (BRASIL, 2006) and was designed as a subsidy for education systems in reflecting on their assessment models. The document was organized into five chapters covering the following subjects: 1) Concepts and functions of evaluation; 2) Assessment and special educational needs; 3) Model configured as a matrix for the evaluation process; 4) Clues to remove barriers to learning; 5) Conclusion.

Initially, this module proposes a reflection on the need for evaluation from a broader perspective that involves all school actors. Then, it proposes that evaluation be a process to support decision-making, being carried out by all those who deal with the student evaluated in order to identify the needs that are required to be met by the school. Finally, it presents a model, configured as a matrix for the evaluation process and concludes by pointing out obstacles to be faced.

It also highlights that the theoretical contribution that motivates the proposed assessment model is inspired by interactive and contextual conceptions of human development. In short, it is based on the premise that development and learning processes result from the interaction of the subjects (with their basic hereditary and biological equipment and their life story) with adults, significant colleagues, and friends, in the different contexts of life (family, school and society) and with the objects of knowledge (BRASIL, 2006 p.46).

In this context, the document presents a list of theorists on which it claims to be based; they are: Winnicot (1956); Erikson (1971); Schaffer (1977 and 1993); Bruner (1977), Brofenbrenner (1987); Wertsh (1979 and 1988); Rappaport, Fiori, and Davis (1981); Kaye (1986); Vygotsky, Luria, and Leontiev (1988); Rogoff (1993); Klein and Fontanive (1995); Pestana (1998), among others. However, it is important to point out that there are no references or citations of works by these authors throughout the text and they were also not described in the bibliographic references of the issue.

The evaluation proposal presented is organized in scopes, dimensions, and aspects that must be considered in identifying special educational needs. The term scope is considered as an activity zone, the field of action. In this way, the sectors to be investigated are presented, starting with the educational and school context, followed by the student and family.

The scope of the educational context encompasses the entire field of action of activities in education. This scope includes human, financial, and technological resources; educational policies; the relevant legislation; the material conditions for implementing the educational intention; academic production; the coordinating and implementing bodies of educational actions; schools and the classroom. However, it should be noted that not all dimensions will be elements of analysis, as the focus is on the school.

Regarding the student as a field to be investigated, the document emphasizes that the purpose of the assessment is to identify the student's special educational needs, not classification or categorization. Therefore, it seeks to know the adroitnesses in learning and their general and specific difficulties that are manifested in the school educational process. Based on this knowledge, it is possible to think and develop strategies that can meet the needs of the student.

The family is considered a significant scenario for affective-emotional and social development. It is in the family that the first bonds develop. From this perspective, it could not be ignored when identifying educational needs, so it is a field to be investigated.

For each scope, dimensions of analysis were established. The dimensions represent sets of variables that make up the scopes and considering the scope of the dimensions, the model also proposes the unfolding of aspects to guide the analyses and facilitate discussions about what should be evaluated and which paths to take to obtain information.

For the Educational Context scope, two dimensions are pointed out to be evaluated: a) the school educational institution; b) pedagogical action. The school educational institution dimension involves the systematic conception of the school reality which leads to the analysis of aspects to be examined, such as philosophy, structure, and functioning. It is considered that the pedagogical action is a dimension resulting from all interactions that take place in the school's context. Thus, it unfolds into aspects that make it possible to investigate the nature of the content to be learned, the methodology, and the assistance provided by teachers and by their own colleagues.

The dimensions suggested for the scope of the student are the level of development and their personal conditions. For the level of development, the document suggests that it be evaluated at school, in the aspects related to its (a) functional characteristics and (b) curricular competencies. Functional characteristics are related to basic skills (motor and psychomotor, cognitive, personal-social), while curriculum competencies relate to learning and using the contents of the different areas of knowledge that make up the curricula.

Regarding personal conditions, the document orients that this dimension is more related to students who have special educational needs arising from deficiencies, syndromes, or high abilities/giftedness, with the purpose of knowing how individual conditions affect the assessed student's learning.

The dimensions of analysis of the family environment refer to the characteristics of the family environment and family life. The document suggests that these dimensions be analyzed through indicators related to different aspects, making it possible to know the conditions of life at home, the educational practices adopted by the family and their relationship with decision-making for the development of students.

The indicators can be transformed into items that will integrate the assessment instruments, such as forms or questionnaires, as well as guiding

observations, interviews, and other procedures necessary for collecting information. In addition, the indicators should serve as elements that will allow knowing the potential, development conditions, and possibilities of the student, in a qualitative approach.

At the end of the chapter, the document highlights the emphasis on psycho-pedagogical assessment, considering the possibility that some students may need the contribution of specialists in the clinical area.

Issue 2 of the collection “Special Education from the perspective of School Inclusion” prepared by Gomes, Poulin, and Figueiredo (2010), was designed to support training courses carried out by the MEC in partnership with the Federal University of Ceará (*Universidade Federal do Ceará - UFC*), focusing on the AEE for students with intellectual disabilities.

This material was organized into two parts. In the first, it presents reflections on the Pedagogy of Denial besides addressing the roles that the AEE teachers must assume in the Multifunctional Resource Room in their dialogue with the regular classroom, with the school, and in the interface with the family. In the second, the material directly addresses the AEE for the student with DI, highlighting the Specialized Educational Service in the Multifunctional Resource Room and the evaluation of the learning processes and the student's inclusion in the school. It also presents a case study.

Regarding the assessment, the material points to the case study to carry out the assessment in the AEE. Based on this methodology, the AEE teacher, in collaboration with the regular school teacher and other professionals, builds the student's profile and identifies the nature of the problem that motivated the student's referral to the Multifunctional Resource Room.

The assessment should cover the following environments: Multifunctional Resource Room, classroom, and family. In each of these environments, the assessment must collect information about the student, considering six major aspects: intellectual development and cognitive functioning; oral expression; the environment; school learning;

affective-social development and social interactions; behaviors and attitudes in a learning situation and psychomotor development.

The authors suggest that, in the Multifunctional Resource Room, students with intellectual disabilities should be evaluated through playful situations and in terms of motor aspects, the development of oral and written expression, logical-mathematical reasoning, cognitive functioning, affectivity (behavior and interaction), and the relationship that the student establishes with knowledge.

Regarding classroom assessment, Gomes, Poulin, and Figueiredo (2010) indicate that the AEE teacher assesses the students' relationship with knowledge, when they respond to the teacher's requests, if the students present an attitude of dependence or autonomy, if they require the use of resources, equipment, and materials for access to knowledge, if they perform better in individual activities, in small groups, or in larger groups, and how is the interaction with other students. Other factors such as classroom management and organization should also be observed by the AEE teacher.

In the assessment with the family, the AEE teacher can obtain information about the students' performance in home activities and their relationship with teaching and school content.

Based on the information obtained in the three environments, a specialized educational service plan is drawn up. This plan comprises the forecast of activities to be carried out with the students at SRM. It is the monitoring phase, which consists of the development of actions aimed at progressing in the development and learning of the students, as well as to improve their interaction in the school environment. Therefore, it is necessary the articulation of the AEE teacher with other professionals and with the family in order to promote favorable conditions for development and learning.

Gomes, Poulin, and Figueiredo (2010) explain that monitoring should take place both in the SRM and in the classroom. At SRM,

monitoring aims to overcome attitudes of dependence and the organization of verbal expression.

As for monitoring in the classroom, a dialogue between the AEE teacher and the teacher in the common room is proposed. The former must try to listen to the difficulties encountered by the latter in teaching students with intellectual disabilities. If the difficulties are within class management or formal education, the school's pedagogical team should discuss them.

At the end of these guidelines, a case study is presented with the respective AEE plan. The proposed case study model comprises five steps, with steps 1 through 4 related to the assessment and the fifth step referring to the specialized educational service plan.

Step 1 corresponds to the presentation of the problem. In the proposed model, there is a description of the students' situation in relation to disability, their behavior in the classroom and succinct information about motor aspects, the development of oral and written expression, logical-mathematical reasoning, cognitive functioning, and affectivity.

In step 2, the complaint brought by the family or the teacher is presented in order to identify the aspects of the difficulties or potential expressed by the student. There is a report of the key information collected in meetings with the institution's professionals, with a teacher in the common room, in the observations of the student in the classroom, on the school premises, and in the evaluations carried out in the Multifunctional Resources Room. Step 3 (identification of the problem) occurs after collecting information and consists of verifying the student's difficulties and potential. Step 4, entitled problem solving, leads us to infer that solutions would be presented to overcome the problem. However, this item only presents the assumption of the nature of the student's problem.

The fifth and final stage consists of the elaboration of the Specialized Educational Service Plan (*plano de atendimento educacional*

*especializado* - PAEE). The PAEE must contain the following items: foreseen objectives; plan activities; interlocution between the AEE teacher and the common classroom teacher; period of care, expected results; results obtained with the specialized educational service plan.

The productions presented here are references for the continuing formation of teachers, given that they are prepared under the Ministry of Education (MEC) and constitute instructional resources to support teacher education in the area, covering the education secretariats of the state and municipal spheres.

### **Brief analysis of productions for teacher training**

The two publications highlighted here suggest an assessment model for identifying special educational needs. Brasil (2006) does not specify intellectual disability, while Gomes, Poulin, and Figueiredo (2010) specify identification in students with intellectual disabilities. However, both indicate paths that AEE teachers can follow to consolidate the identification of special educational needs. By analyzing the proposed models, we found elements that suggest contradictions and denote a certain superficiality regarding theoretical subsidies on learning and development in order to support the training of teachers and, therefore, their practice in assisting students with disabilities in SRM.

Overall, the assessment model suggested in both publications points to a path that seems to direct the teacher's gaze only to the highlighted elements, without proposing a discussion of the context and the interrelationship between them. Despite expressing that there is no intention of "stiffening" the teacher's performance, the content of the fascicles reveals a technical perspective that undoubtedly leads the teacher to reproduce the proposal without reaching awareness of the meaning of the aspects being investigated. In other words, a form without content is presented.



It is also observed that the proposed models are based on a theoretical superficiality regarding human development and learning. The theoretical basis cited in the first document, for example, presents an eclecticism of tendencies that focus on contradictions related to the conception of learning and development. Furthermore, despite citing the authors' last name and year of work to demonstrate the pillars from which the evaluation model was built, none of the authors are mentioned throughout the document, nor are direct and/or indirect citations made to present their theoretical contributions.

When pointing out the diversity of theoretical perspectives present in the analyzed materials, we are not trying to elect the uniqueness of a theory to respond to the demands of inclusive education. More than that, we understand it is necessary to appropriate consistent theoretical foundations when analyzing a phenomenon so that we can understand the processes engendered in a reality. However, we observe that the content available to the teacher does not provide them with subsidies to appropriate scientific knowledge to the point of reaching a certain theoretical domain or even enriching their pedagogical work from the intertwining between theory and practice.

The assessment model for identifying special educational needs proposed by Brasil (2006) leads to the production of an arsenal of information related to the three areas (educational, student, and family contexts), but there is no note that promotes the dialogue between these areas, the focus ends up turning to the student. There is no proposal to reflect on the meaning implicit in each information collected nor on how the characteristics of each scope can clarify the educational needs required by the student. Collecting information without being clear about the purpose of this action and without theoretical subsidies that enable understanding the aspects engendered in the learning and development process makes this process inefficient to contribute to the identification of

NEE and to equip the teacher in the systematization and organization of teaching adequate to the special educational needs required by the student.

When considering the unfolding of the areas to be evaluated, we found a voluminous set of information presented superficially, with no articulation within. Thinking about the daily lives of teachers, we cannot fail to reflect on issues related to the temporal space between the collection of information, their analysis, and the elaboration of the treatment plan. There does not seem to be enough time available for more in-depth studies that provide theoretical support that can aid teaching practice, especially regarding the preparation of the PAEE.

It is as if the teacher received 1000 puzzle pieces but no references on how to put the pieces together. In this analogy, the pieces are all the information learned; the reference would be the conception of man, of education that this teacher has, which would be made available from the theoretical contribution, expressing the internalization of concepts. Without theoretical support, the information raised by the teacher may seem fragmented and meaningless.

We understand that, if the mediating agents do not have theoretical and methodological tools that make it possible to go beyond the immediate appearance, supporting their pedagogical action, the agents will not be able to understand special educational needs. Thus, their actions do not contribute to the students' learning and development regardless of the possibilities and limitations that these students present.

Chaves (2014) argues that the processes involving teacher education should not be limited to pedagogical workshops, short courses, or suggestions for pedagogical proposals that reduce training to "how to do it", characterizing a fragmented movement. Prior, however,

[...] [they] should lead to reflection and understanding about the confrontation and possibilities of formal educational action, the needs and potential of children, and the reasons that can be generated in a logic of humanizing education (CHAVES, 2014, p.119).

The understanding about the confrontation and the possibility of educational actions can become possible from the appropriation of consistent theoretical foundations that raise the feeling of collectivity and humanization of the person through the appropriation of scientific knowledge (FACCI, 2009).

Considering the theoretical-methodological subsidies provided by the Ministry of Education, we face a reality in which the assessment to identify the special educational needs required by the student presents significant gaps that make it impossible a practice which results in effective actions for the planning and organizing activities that can meet the specific needs of the student with DI.

## **Conclusion**

The development of this study made it possible to analyze how the legal frameworks establish the structure and functioning of the AEE, as well as the attributions of the teacher who works in the Multifunctional Resource Room. We also identified MEC publications used in teacher training to guide the identification of special educational needs.

In general, the legal frameworks are specific regarding the attributions of the teacher who works in the AEE, but they are not clear about identifying special educational needs. In turn, the highlighted publications do not present consistent theoretical and methodological foundations that can provide the teacher with tools that support both the identification process and the preparation and execution of the individual development plan.

The analyzed documents show both theoretical and methodological gaps for the teacher to carry out the identification process in order to

understand de facto the nature and dimension of the educational needs required by the student referred to the AEE and to promote school education.

We consider that the lack of a consistent theoretical field to orient the teacher in the construction of pedagogical practices for the identification of special educational needs constitutes an urgent demand for studies. In this sense, it is important to develop further research in order to investigate political, conceptual, and educational constructs and foundations that provide opportunities for the organization of school education. This organization, in turn, enables the humanization of the students regardless of their objective conditions.

## References

- BRASIL. *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional*. Brasília: DF, 1996.
- BRASIL. *Resolução CNE/CEB Nº 2, de 11 de setembro de 2001. Institui Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação Especial na Educação Básica*. Brasília: MEC, 2001. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/CEB0201.pdf>. Acesso em 13 de jun de 2020.
- BRASIL. *Avaliação para identificação das necessidades educacionais especiais*. 2. ed. Brasília: MEC, Secretaria de Educação Especial, 2006. (Série: Saberes e práticas da inclusão).
- BRASIL. *Política Nacional de Educação Especial na perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*. Brasília, DF: MEC/SEESP, 2008. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/politicaeducespecial.pdf>. Acesso em: 27 dez. 2019.
- BRASIL. *Resolução nº 04/2009. Diretrizes Operacionais para o Atendimento Educacional Especializado na Educação Básica, modalidade Educação Especial*. Ministério da Educação, Conselho Nacional de Educação/ Câmara de Educação Superior. SEESP, 2009.
- CARVALHO, R. E. *Removendo Barreiras para a Aprendizagem*. 2ª ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2001.
- CHAVES, M. Formação contínua e práticas educativas: possibilidades humanizadoras. In: CAÇÃO, M. I.; MELLO, S.A.; SILVA, V. P. (orgs.). *Educação e desenvolvimento: contribuições da abordagem histórico-cultural para a educação escolar*. Jundiaí. Paco Editorial, 2014, p. 119-139.

FACCI, M. G. D. A intervenção do psicólogo na formação de professores: contribuições da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural. In: MARINHO-ARAÚJO, C. M. (Org.). *Psicologia Escolar: novos cenários e contextos de pesquisa, formação e prática*. Campinas, SP: Editora Alínea, 2009. p. 107- 131.

GOMES, A. L. L. V.; POULIN, J. R.; FIGUEIREDO, R. V. *A Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Inclusão Escolar: o atendimento educacional especializado para alunos com deficiência intelectual*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Especial; [Fortaleza]: Universidade Federal do Ceará, 2010. v. 2. (Coleção A Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Inclusão Escolar).

UNESCO. Declaração de Salamanca e linha de ação sobre necessidades educativas especiais. Brasília: CORDE, 1994.

WITEZE, E. M.; SILVA, R. H. R. Políticas educacionais inclusivas em tempos neoliberais: o dito, o não dito e o mal dito. *Argumentos Pró-Educação*, Pouso Alegre, v. 1, n° 3, p. 370 – 391, set. - dez., 2016. Disponível em: <http://ojs.univas.edu.br/index.php?journal=argumentosproeducacao&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=137>. Acesso em: 09 abril 2020.

Received in October 2020.

Approved in August 2021.